



LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

C. BR 45 .H84 1854
S. Cowie, Morgan, 1816-1900.
S. Scripture difficulties
B.





SCRIPTURE DIFFICULTIES.

SERMONS

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

INCLUDING

THE HULSEAN LECTURES FOR 1854;

AND

THREE OTHER SERMONS.

BY

THE REV. MORGAN COWIE, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
HULSEAN LECTURER.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

1855.

Cambridge :
Printed at the University Press.

TO
THOMAS CHARLES GELDART, LL.D.
MASTER OF TRINITY HALL,
VICE-CHANCELLOR,

TO THE
REVEREND WILLIAM WHEWELL, D.D.
MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE,

TO THE
REVEREND RALPH TATHAM, D.D.
MASTER OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,

THESE LECTURES, DELIVERED BY THEIR APPOINTMENT,
ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED.

*Stoke d'Abernon, Cobham,
January, 1855.*

THE REV. JOHN HULSE, M.A. by his will bearing date July 21, 1777, founded a Lectureship in the University of Cambridge, to be held by a Clergyman in the University of the degree of Master of Arts, and under the age of forty years: the Lecturer to be elected annually on Christmas-day, or within seven days after, by the Vice-Chancellor, the Master of Trinity College, and the Master of St John's College, or any two of them: the subject of the Lectures to be as follows; "The Evidence of Revealed Religion; the Truth and Excellence of Christianity; the Prophecies and Miracles; direct or collateral proofs of the Christian Religion, especially the collateral arguments; the more difficult texts, or obscure parts of Holy Scripture;" or any one or more of these topics, at the discretion of the Lecturer.



CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

S. MATTHEW XXII. 31, 32.

PAGE

But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living 1

LECTURE II.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 44.

There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body 35

LECTURE III.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 35.

How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? 63

LECTURE IV.

ON CHRIST PREDICTING HIS OWN RESURRECTION.

S. JOHN II. 18—22.

Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest

these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said . . . 91

LECTURE V.

THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

S. MATTHEW XII. 31, 32.

All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. 117

LECTURE VI.

THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

S. MATTHEW XII. 31, 32.

All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come 145

LECTURE VII.

PERFECTION THROUGH SUFFERING.

HEBREWS II. 10.

PAGE

<i>It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings</i>	173
--	-----

LECTURE VIII.

MORAL QUALITIES OF FAITH.

S. MATTHEW XII. 33.

<i>Them that believe to the saving of the soul</i>	205
--	-----

SERMON FOR GOOD FRIDAY.

S. LUKE XXIII. 28.

<i>Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves</i>	3
---	---

SERMON FOR EASTER DAY.

ROMANS VI. 4.

<i>As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of God the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life</i>	21
---	----

SERMON.

INDIFFERENCE TO THE WORLD NOT ANY HINDERANCE TO
ACTIVE EXERTION.

S. MATTHEW VI. 33.

	PAGE
<i>Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteous- ness; and all these things shall be added unto you</i>	37

ERRATUM.

Page ix. *Table of Contents*, LECTURE VIII., for S. MATTHEW XII. 33.
read HEBREWS X. 39.

LECTURE I.

S. MATTHEW XXII. 31—32.

But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

I HAVE said on a previous occasion, when preaching from this pulpit, that the attacks on the Catholic Faith, which have to be repelled in the present generation, arise chiefly from within. This is true of the grounds, and evidences of the faith, as well as of the actual things to be believed. Men do not at the present time attack Christianity by endeavouring to throw entire discredit on its credentials, but those who unfortunately err from the simplicity of the truth, have tried to explain away, to mythicize, to diminish the witness for Christianity, to substitute for a solid reality an empty shadow, which leaves us without any permanent independent foundations of faith. Even those facts of the Gospel, which are left apparently standing, have in this manner been emptied of all substance, and made to appear like the fables of ancient mythology,—vehicles of doctrine rather than substantial verities, such as S. John says, ‘ we have

heard, we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled.'

The process which some modern interpreters have applied to the Scriptures seems to assume, fundamentally, though not ostensibly, the untenable ground which Hume advanced long ago, viz. that supernatural effects, even if competently witnessed, were in their nature so incredible, that they ought at once to be set aside on that account.

They do not indeed contend, that the whole should be believed a falsehood¹, they do not invalidate, as Hume did, human testimony; but, allowing the sincerity of the writers of our Gospel histories, they contend that these writers did not intend to put before us matters of fact, that they did not wish us to understand from their narratives—occurrences actual and physical; but that, after an oriental fashion, or in the style of the older mythologists, they dressed up in the drapery of imaginary facts certain doctrines which they wished to inculcate, they presented ideas to mankind, under the form of certain εἰκόνας which should stand forth as the representatives

¹ Strauss expressly guards himself against this, and quotes *Usteri* from the *Ullman's u. Umbreit's theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832. 4 Heft. 'We must not suppose that any one of them (the first Christians) sat down at a table and invented the tales like poetical fictions, and committed them to writing. No, these stories, like all other legends, were formed by little and little, in a way which cannot now be traced out, gained consistency more and more, and at last were chronicled in our evangelical writings.'—*Introduction*, § 9.

of the leading points of the system, but were not meant to be credited as actual substantial existences¹.

And the root of this system is a disbelief in all miraculous interferences. Thus Strauss², in speaking of the resurrection of our Lord, makes general reflections on the impossibility of any resurrection of the body. 'If the soul³ have to restore the immediate organs of its activity, like a diseased limb, organs which have been rendered useless by death, this would be impossible, because, in order to produce any effect on the body, the soul has need of these very organs; so that even if any charm kept the soul in the body after death, it could not prevent its corruption, as it would be incapable of exerting any influence; or if by a first miracle the soul were brought back into the body, it must by a second miracle have restored to it those bodily organs which had perished. But that would be an immediate interference of the Deity with the regular course of natural life, which is incompatible with enlightened ideas on the relation between God and the world.'

Now, it seems that throughout the investiga-

¹ The difference between a *myth* and a *legend* seems to be, that the former starts with an *idea*, and dresses it up under fictitious circumstances; the latter starts from *facts*, and they are altered, increased, or diminished, and embellished to bring out certain ideas.

² *Leben Jesu.* 3, 4, 137.

³ The Germans, in metaphysical language, mean by the soul (*seele*), the spirit of man when *in his body*.

tions undertaken by Strauss, it is the necessity which these 'enlightened ideas' involve, of rejecting all miracle, which induces him to propose the mythical theory as the solution of difficulties. This then is the process: to attack the *genuineness* and *authenticity* of the Gospels, and afterwards to account in a free and unrestrained manner for the Gospel history as it now stands.

In the first place, this method apparently leaving the facts untouched, questions the genuineness of the Gospels, but allows this much: 'no doubt these were the early impressions of Christians; these were the histories and legends which became accepted as the foundation of Christianity;' but it asserts 'our histories are not testimonies of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the Word.' Having thus got rid of the technical stronghold of the genuineness of the Gospels, it attacks their authenticity by shewing that the parts cohere with difficulty, by getting together all the discrepancies, real or imaginary, which must be found in independent accounts of the same circumstances, related honestly and artlessly by men having high objects in view, variations which have no bearing whatever on the main features of the narrative; and then our objectors offer a solution of the assumed inconsistencies, by throwing over the whole a mantle of mythical accommodation, in which historical accuracy is neither intended nor reasonably to be expected, where facts will be mixed up with fiction; and

the Gospel history is frittered away into a series of fabulous legends, to be taken only as the evidence of certain floating ideas, prevalent at some period of the existence of the Church, subsequent by about a hundred years to the birth of Christ.

These views have been combated successfully by men much more competent to the task than I can pretend to be ; but there still remains to meet and oppose opinions or difficulties which are the germ of the unbelieving spirit, fully developed in these foreign speculations, which unfortunately themselves are so widely diffused amongst us ; and I propose to select a subject for this course of Lectures which is one more than all others exposed to the doubts and hesitations of men who give free rein to their reasonings, and admit the control of the Word of God only in a subsidiary and secondary sense, inclining rather to reject its authority, if their reason condemns the conclusions to which it inevitably leads.

Of course, if such a conduct of the understanding is influential in any subject, it will chiefly be where the whole is confessedly a great difficulty, and where the revelation shews us things to which present experience has no parallel, and which must be hard to be understood :— I mean the revelation of the future life. I shall endeavour in what I have to say to avoid all modern personal controversy, and all differences between Churches, in order more punctually to

fulfil the duty devolving on the Christian preacher to promote the *general* conviction of the truths of revelation, without, in the words of the Founder of this Lecture, 'descending to any particular sects or controversies (so much to be lamented) among Christians themselves.'

The difficulties and obscurities then to which I wish to call your attention, and with respect to which I would offer some remarks, are connected with the resurrection of the body—the qualities of the resurrection-body, or pneumatic-body of S. Paul, the difficulties of personal identity and the separate existence of the soul, and the prophecies of our Lord's resurrection.

The field of discussion is sufficiently wide to occupy a much longer time than can be devoted to it in so short a course of Lectures. It must therefore be my endeavour to supply food for private meditation and reflection, without establishing conclusions by means of elaborate argument; but rather indicating sources of information, and summing up the results to which researches have led, selecting and concentrating that which seems to me well-founded, and valuable in the labours of the learned, and endeavouring, at times, to put in the modern language of the pulpit, those reasons and trains of thought by which the orthodox writers of our communion have supported the faith of the Church. I am sure that the more we read the works of those great men, whom the Church of England can

number amongst its theologians in times of old, the more we become convinced that there is little that is new to be advanced in the *substance*, however we may make it appear new in the *manner*. As the student of the evidences of religion finds continually that the sophisms and objections of modern writers, who bring out their attacks with all energy and great confidence in the originality of their views, have constantly been urged, examined, and refuted before ; so I have found it to be the case, that many things said in defence of the sacred Scriptures, and many arguments that strike us as novel, and convincing, many modes of thought that seem to come with a new force to the encounter, have been often and better treated before. And when we have found this to be the case in our own study of the subject, it must make us constantly apprehensive of the imputation of plagiarism, if we pretend to originality, and make us naturally anxious to take our stand in that true catholic position which the Christian preacher should endeavour to occupy :—to ask for the old paths that we may walk in them ; and in bringing out things new and old, to take care that what is new coheres aptly with the old, that it has its root firmly clinging to those ancient foundations, on which the waves of unbelief have beaten ineffectually for many a century.

The order in which I propose to consider these subjects will be as follows :—

1. Assuming what the Scriptures tell us of

the resurrection of the body, to examine how far this doctrine is peculiar to the Christian or latter dispensation.

2. To ascertain what the Scriptures tell us of the qualities of the resurrection-body, or pneumatic-body of S. Paul.

3. To establish the truth of personal identity in the resurrection, on grounds not inconsistent with physical facts.

4. To shew, in answer to Strauss' objections, that our Lord did predict his own resurrection, and to explain the difficulties which he finds in the Gospel narrative in reference thereto.

Such subjects being suited to the period of the Ecclesiastical year at which these Lectures are delivered, may, by God's blessing, be conducive to appropriate meditations by all of us, on points connected with our hopes and fears as Christians, and may tend to make us stedfast and immoveable in the faith of the Gospel, and not barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In each case I shall endeavour to select some difficult or obscure passage of holy Scripture, the explanation or comment on which will have reference to the subjects described, in their proper order.

That which is to occupy us this day is the resurrection of the body. As to the fact of such a resurrection being constantly taught in the New Testament there can be no doubt, and it is

needless to offer any proof of it. We may assume it as a doctrine of the Gospel, that the dead shall rise again. We shall hereafter have to consider what is involved in these words, and we may therefore proceed to consider to what extent this doctrine of a resurrection was peculiar to the Gospel: whether, and in what degree, it was known either to the Jews or the Heathen.

Now, in the text, our Lord arguing against the Sadducees, asserts that they might have learned the doctrine from the law: and there is some difficulty in following the argument He produces to convince and silence them. The conclusion drawn from the words of God to Moses has sometimes been, that as He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have been living in some sense at the time when God proclaimed Himself their God. But that they were not living in the ordinary sense is certain, because the same might be said of them that S. Peter said of David: 'He is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.' They were therefore not living bodies, and it remains that we conclude their souls were alive. In this view, the argument of our Saviour is to prove the immortality of the soul. And so, to controvert the religious system of the Sadducees, the whole fabric of which falls to the ground, if its corner-stone, the denial of the separate existence of spirit, is refuted by the sure word of God himself.

This is one interpretation of the passage. The great objection to it is, that it is expressly said our Lord referred to the resurrection of the dead, ‘concerning the dead, that they rise;’ and it is certainly not *obvious* that the separate existence of the soul draws as a necessary consequence after it the revivification of the body, though some have endeavoured to shew this: on the contrary, it might be said, that there are reasons to be urged against the resurrection of the body, if we reason without a revelation, while the fact of *a* future life, even of the soul only, as meeting many of the moral difficulties which suggest its probability, is assented to very readily.

In order therefore to support the interpretation put upon our Lord’s argument, it is urged, that the words ‘resurrection of the dead’ are used in a restricted sense. The word *ἐξεγείρειν* is sometimes used for ‘to make to stand,’ and so, ‘to continue,’ ‘to be preserved.’ Thus S. Paul quotes the ninth chapter of Exodus, where God saith to Pharaoh, ‘Even for this very purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee.’ And the Septuagint represents the words thus: ‘For this cause hast thou been preserved to this day.’ It is argued, that when S. Luke says, ‘the dead are raised,’ he may mean only, that they are preserved¹.

Now the use of the New Testament is certainly

¹ Rom. ix. 17: *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε.* Ex. ix. 16: *ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης.*

to appropriate the words *νεκροὺς ἐγείρειν*, and *ἐγείρεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*, to the Resurrection of the Body, in the first place literally, and then figuratively in some places, to conversion of men from sin to holiness, because of the aptness of the figure which represents men in a state of unrepented sin, bringing death, as now *dead*, dead in trespasses and sins. It requires therefore some very strong reasons to induce the student of the Gospel before us, to give up here that primary and natural meaning of the words ‘as touching the resurrection of the dead’ (S. Matt. xxii. 31). ‘As touching the dead that they rise’ (S. Mark xii. 26), ‘Now that the dead are raised’ (S. Luke xx. 37), which at all events appear to refer to the resurrection of the body.

In the next place, an argument which at first has some speciousness in it, is used about the word resurrection. It is observed that, in all three Gospels, in reporting the answer of our Lord, the words *the dead*, are always used as the masculine *οἱ νεκροὶ, τοὺς νεκροὺς*, and never *τὰ νεκρά* in the neuter, *dead bodies*.

But this is surely insufficient; for, in numberless passages of the New Testament, where the resurrection of the body is plainly spoken of, the masculine is used. S. Paul, arguing before king Agrippa, of the reasonableness of his confidence in the resurrection of Christ, says, generally, ‘Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead’ (*νεκροὺς*).

In the 15th chapter of the 1 Cor., treating expressly of the resurrection of the body, 'we have testified of God, that he raised up Christ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not,' εἰπὲρ ἀρὰ οἱ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, and other places in that chapter. Moreover, even speaking of dead bodies, it would not be contrary to the phraseology of the New Testament to call them νεκροὶ, for, in the phrase 'Let the dead bury their dead,' we have ἀφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς, where the word θάψαι prevents our taking the second νεκροὶ in a spiritual sense¹.

The arguments deduced from the word ἐξεγείρειν², and the words 'resurrection of the dead,' which tend to prove a restricted sense of the latter, do not seem therefore entitled to much consideration.

The interpretation which assumes, that our Lord here argues for a future life, without asserting the resurrection of the dead body, cannot derive support from such subsidiary arguments, and it must be examined on its own ground.

Now the question of the Sadducees³ refers to

¹ See *Euthymius Zigabenus*, quoted by *Alford* on *Matt.* viii. 22.

² The word ἐξεγείρειν only occurs in two places, (1) in that already referred to, *Rom.* ix. 17; and (2) in 1 *Cor.* vi. 14, 'and God hath both raised up (ἤγειρε) the Lord, and will raise up (ἐξεγερεῖ) us by his own power.'

³ The curious mystical meaning attributed to this passage by *S. Augustine*, is as follows: 'Septem fratres, &c. *Matt.* xxii. 25. Intelliguntur homines impii, qui fructum justitiæ non potuerunt afferre in terra per omnes septem mundi ætates, quibus ista terra consistit:

a state in which men's bodies would be in existence, and when those relationships which spring out of corporeal existence would, in their expectations, be necessarily revived. And it does not seem at all clear how they could be convinced of great error with respect to their unbelief in the resurrection of the body, unless the fact of the resurrection of the body is clearly proved by our Saviour. He corrects first of all their erroneous ideas about the state of those risen from the dead, and then returns to convince them of error in their general conception of the impossibility of the resurrection. It is as though he had told them: Your ideas of the relations of human beings, when raised, are erroneous, and therefore your objection to the resurrection founded thereon is mistaken; moreover, you ought from the law to have concluded, that there must be a resurrection. Your error is twofold; not knowing the Scriptures, you have missed the instruction they give you as to a *resurrection*; and, not knowing the power of God, you have supposed that the difficulties you find in the laws of the method of preservation of animal life, and the positive social enactments of Moses, are *permanent*, and cannot be set aside in the new state of man, ensuing after the resurrection.

Now, if this view is correct, we ought to find in

postea enim et ipsa terra transiet, per quam omnes illi quasi septem mariti steriliter transierunt.—*Questiones Evangeliorum*, Lib. I. Q. 32.

our Lord's argument, a convincing proof of the resurrection of the body.

Before endeavouring, however, to put in clear language the solution of the difficulty which seems to me most in character with the general current of the Gospel scheme, let us observe, that in fact the resurrection of man must mean the resurrection of the body. We do not at present enter into the question of identity; but *a body* is surely necessary to constitute a living man. We do not mean by man a purely spiritual being; and therefore, if the man now dead is to live again, he must have a *body*; and whatever the resurrection-body may be, the fact that the Scriptures refer to the future life of man, always by words which import a re-impacting the principle of life to that which died, we must not suppose that we are gaining much in the way of clearness, if we use the words 'resurrection of man' instead of resurrection of the body, because we cannot have a conception of a resurrection at all, unless we mean thereby restoration of a corporeal frame to the disembodied spirit¹. But to this we shall return again hereafter.

¹ Notwithstanding the objection urged against these words it seems to me that we are quite justified in using them. The idea is of course indefinite: but it is generally understood, dim as it is; and common modes of speaking are surely to be legitimately used in parænesis, though it may be right, in philosophical discussions, to require a more rigid adherence to a settled nomenclature, and exact expressions. To use great plainness of speech must mean that we are to address men in the phraseology of the many, and not let metaphysi-

The solution of the difficulty which seems to hang over the Saviour's argument, appears to me to depend on the following idea. S. Luke reports our Lord's words as follows: 'Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.' This points out to us that we are to see in the words of God to Moses an assertion of his being now the God of the patriarchs, and that we are thence to conclude they must rise again. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are declared to be God's—His Son's—and hence the children of the resurrection. Sonship of God is therefore of necessity a state which involves inheritance of Godlike incorruption, and the declaration of this Sonship is a declaration, that 'this corruptible must put on incorruption.' Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are declared by God to be *His*¹, after their bodies have crumbled into dust; they must therefore have to inherit an incorruptible life hereafter, at sometime or another, and therefore live again.

In this sense, in respect of having an incorruptible life, Adam, before the fall, was a Son of

cal forms mar the simplicity of the gospel. The message is to all the people: *he that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*

¹ In like manner *S. Paul*, in the epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 16, asserts that God proclaimed himself the God of the Old Testament worthies who died in faith, because they thereby proved that they sought the happiness of a future life. 'Now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: *wherefore* God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city:' *i. e.* he is their God because they have an inheritance of incorruption, and have diligently sought it in faith.

God. Those who had the *promise*¹ of redemption are called by anticipation, Sons of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God pre-eminently, having life in Himself; and one of the reasons we find assigned for this peculiar title being bestowed upon Him, is his resurrection from the dead. He was, says S. Paul, 'declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.' And all the regenerate are made Sons of God, as having an incorruptible inheritance, the completion of their *υιοθεσία*, or adoption, being looked for in the redemption of the *body* (Rom. viii. 23). In like manner the angels are said to be Sons of God because they are imperishable,—have an enduring existence.

Bishop Bull sees in the words of the promise to the patriarchs, intention of conveying the idea of eternal life². He says: 'There are in the Law general promises; or, at least, given in general

¹ See the passage quoted from *S. Chrysostom*, (p. 17).

² And *Dr Samuel Clarke, Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion*, p. 241, Ed. 6. The Jewish Rabbis too held this opinion, 'God, speaking to Abraham, says: "I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee, the land in which thou sojournest." And yet it is certain that Abraham and the succeeding patriarchs did not possess that land; it is necessary therefore that they should rise again, that they may enjoy the promised gifts! else the promises of God would be vain and unfulfilled. Hence, therefore, not the immortality of the soul alone is proved, but also an essential foundation of the Law, *viz.* the resurrection of the dead.'—*Manassch Ben Israel, De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, p. 7. See also the arguments of *Eulogius apud Photium*. ccxxx. from the third Book of the *Decretum in Samaritanos*.

terms, in which eternal life not only may be understood, but it is evidently the Divine intention that it should ; such as, *I will be thy God*, and, *I will bless thee*. That in these promises, thus generally expressed, it is possible those blessings are intended which take place only after death, who can doubt? That God should be the God of any one what does it signify, but that God will embrace him with Divine benevolence? But such benevolence as is Divine, and worthy of God, can be only that beyond which there is nothing greater or better ; it must also be benevolence of the longest duration, that is eternal ; most powerful in effect, and therefore liberating from death and destruction. That God intended that under these words, eternal life should be understood, appears from the words of Christ and His Apostles¹.

Let us then understand the declaration of God to Moses, ‘that he was even the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,’ after they were dead and buried, as a proclamation of their having, as His sons, an inheritance of incorruption, and therefore that they should rise again².

¹ *Harmonia Apostolica*, Diss. ii. c. x. § 8.

² This seems to me entirely to accord with the sense of St Chrysostom’s explanation of the passage : οὐχὶ τῶν οὐκ ὄντων, φησὶ, καὶ καθάπαξ ἀφανισθέντων, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι ἀναστησομένων. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, ἡμῖν, ἀλλ’, Εἰμὶ, τῶν ὄντων καὶ τῶν ζώντων. “Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ Ἀδὰμ, εἰ καὶ ἔζη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἔφαγεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, ἀπέθανε τῇ ἀποφάσει, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι, εἰ καὶ ἐτεθνήκεσαν, ἔζων τῇ ὕποσχεσει τῆς ἀναστάσεως.—*Homil. in Matthæum*, LXX. al. LXXI. Benedictine Ed Paris, 1836. Tom. vii. pp. 778, 9.

The fact of the appellation, 'sons of God,' being given generally in the Old Testament to the pious, points also to the conclusion which may be drawn as to the extent of the knowledge of the Resurrection which prevailed among the Jews.

That our Lord came to 'bring life and immortality to light,' must mean, as it has been shewn by Bishop Sherlock¹, 'that he gave full, clear, indubitable instruction on this important point, and not that it was utterly unknown before. The very fact of his teaching the Sadducees their error in

¹ See his sermon on this text. He says, 'To bring anything to light may signify according to the idiom of the English tongue, to discover or reveal anything which was perfectly unknown before; but the word in the original is so far from countenancing, that it will hardly admit of this sense. The Greek runs thus: φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν. Now φωτίζειν signifies (not to bring to light, but) to enlighten, illustrate, or clear up anything. John i. 9: ὁ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, "the true light which lighteneth every man," not, which bringeth every man to light. 1 Cor. iv. 5: ὁ φωτίζει τὰ κρυπτά τοῦ σκότους, "who shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness," (E. V.); more suitably, who shall throw light on the hidden things of darkness, these actions of wicked men not being perfectly unknown before, but their root, origin, motive, being not discerned.'

The verb is sometimes *transitive*, sometimes *intransitive*. In the former sense the lexicographers adopt the sense assigned by Bp. Sherlock as the first meaning, and the subsequent ecclesiastical use of φωτισμός for baptism, and φωτιζόμενοι for the baptized, agrees with it. *Suidas*, however, gives only the meaning which is adopted in the English translation, εἰς φῶς ἄγειν: and *Kuster*, in his Latin Version, supplies the sense, *illuminare, illustrate*, in brackets.

φωτίζειν sæpe hoc sensu legitur ut explicandum sit, *docere* ut Judd. xiii. 8. 2 Reg. xii. 2, ubi Alexandrini Hebr. ׀׀׀׀׀׀ per φωτίζειν expresserunt, add. Ps. xiii. 4. *Kuinoel* in *Ruperti Commentationes Theologicæ*. Vol. III. p. 182.

rejecting the doctrine, out of the book of Moses, and urging them with the warning, that it was in consequence of their ignorance of their Scriptures that they held false views, proves that there was a revelation of the Resurrection to be deduced from those Scriptures. And the fact of the Pharisees believing in a Resurrection shews the same. Their idea of the Resurrection doubtless was restricted, and in some degree erroneous. Some only believed in a resurrection of the just¹. The

¹ Thus *Josephus* of the Pharisees, *Antiq.* 18, 2: καὶ τοῖς μὲν εἰργμὸν αἰδίων προσαθέσθαι τοῖς δὲ ραστῶνῃν τοῦ ἀναβισῦν: and *De Bello Judaico*, 2, 12. It is said, however, that *Josephus* is wrong in attributing this opinion to the Pharisees, by *Drusius*, *Knappe*, *Kuinoel*. See *Blomfield*, *Rec. Synoptica*, on Acts xxiv. 15.

That the souls of the wicked were mortal was a doctrine held by some ancients. *Justin Martyr* is accused of holding this doctrine, (*Dialog. c. Tryph.*) p. 111, E: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημι πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς...αἱ δὲ (πονηρῶν sc.) κολάζονται ἔστ' ἂν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ Θεὸς θέλει); though in other places he speaks of the punishment of the wicked being everlasting. (*Apoloq.* pp. 76, 91, 92). *Tatian* also believed that the soul died with the body, but would be restored with it. *Oratio contra Græcos*, § 13: θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λύεται μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, μὴ γινώσκουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὕστερον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι, θάνατον διὰ τιμωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα.

Theophilus ad Autolyicum, Lib. i. § 7, however, speaks of this restoration of the soul to the body in similar terms, without meaning that in the interval it had perished. This may be said therefore in a different sense from that dogma of certain Arabians mentioned *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* vi. 37.

Dupin ascribes to *Irenæus* similar opinions, and refers to Lib. ii. c. 51, 59—64; Lib. iv. c. 37 and 73; Lib. v. c. 32. *Tertullian*, *de Resurrect. Carn.* c. 2, relates that *Lucanus*, a disciple of *Marcion*, taught the death of the soul; and in the 7th ch. of the *Præscrip. Hæreticorum*, he says the doctrine came from the *Epicureans*.

Jews believed, most generally, says Bishop Pearson, that some men should live again, and some should not; because, in the book of Daniel it is written, ‘Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,’ and not *all* shall awake. S. Paul, arguing before Felix, says ‘that the Jews allowed there should be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust.’ Josephus¹ says that ‘the Pharisees believed the soul immortal; that the souls of good men only passed into another body; that the souls of the wicked are punished with eternal punishment².’ From such testimonies it is clear that the doctrines of the Future Life, and the Resurrection, were not entirely new³; and if we come to enquire how men may have obtained them, we find, that in addition to those dim intima-

Dr Macknight on the Epistles, 1 Thess. iv. 16, adopts the curious notion that the bodies of the wicked will be destroyed in the general conflagration, having been previously raised from the grave.

¹ *Ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἀφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φάυλων αἰδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι.* *Josephus, de Bello Judaico*, II. 8, 14.

² The Jews who had no express revelation of that matter, did yet believe it upon a constant tradition: as appears from all their writings, and particularly from the translation of the last verse of the book of Job, which in the LXX. runs thus: ‘So Job died, being old and full of days; but ’tis written that he shall rise again, with those whom the Lord raises up.’—*Dr Samuel Clarke, Three Practical Essays*, p. 76, 6th Ed. 1740.

³ One reason against its being popularly held among the Jews may be deduced from the remark of St Mark (ix. 10), that the disciples were doubtful of the meaning of the words ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. Being unlearned men of humble origin, it is probable that the speculations of the more educated classes were unknown to them.—See Lecture iv.

tions which the law and the prophets held forth, and which it is needless to recapitulate, it may be inferred from the principles of natural religion that there should be a future life. And this, though it does not lead to the full consequence of a resurrection of the body¹, yet certainly is no small support to such a doctrine when it is once conceived. Bishop Sherlock thus argues the case: ‘All men have some sense of right and wrong, and of their being accountable for the things done in this world, which account not being taken in this world, as the least degree of observation enables men to see, they conclude, or they feel, from the very force of reason and conscience, that there is an account to be given hereafter².’ The

¹ Yet Cardinal Bellarmine, *Controversiæ Generales*, Tom. II. p. 566, argues that the immortality of the soul involves the idea of a resurrection of the body: ‘Apud Judæos olim fuisse usitatissimum habere pro eadem quæstione, illam de resurrectione, et illam de animorum immortalitate...cum anima Rationalis sit vera forma corporis, et proinde vera pars hominis, non est verisimile, Deum voluisse animam perpetuo vivere sine corpora.’

Phocylides has some singular lines (99, 100), which couple the resurrection of the body with the notion of the immortality of the soul:

καὶ τάχα δ' ἐκ γαίης ἐλπίζομεν εἰς φάος ἐλθεῖν
λείψαν' ἀποιχομένων, κ. τ. λ.

But these hexameters are generally considered a forgery, subsequent to the Christian Æra, and not the production of the ancient Ionian poet.

² The common opinion of the people of Rome may be taken from the speech of Titus Vespasian to his soldiers: ‘Who does not know that the souls of brave men when set free by the sword in action, from their bodies, are received and kept in the purest element, the air; and the good deities and propitious heroes shew them to their own offspring; but the souls of those men who die of disease, even

darkness in which such an opinion is involved without revelation is no doubt very great; but still it exists, and men go on to add to it. Thus, the rewards and punishments which they naturally imagine as the result of evil or good conduct in this life, were generally of a *corporeal*¹ nature, and yet they saw the bodies of the dead dissolve and perish. This involved them in contradictions. Plutarch², writing about the legend of the disappearance of Romulus, gives other instances in which persons who disappeared were supposed to have been translated, and he proceeds in this manner: 'There are many unreasonable, fabulous accounts, which carry mortal beings into the society of the Gods. To suppose that virtue is deprived altogether of a Divine reward would be impious and illiberal; but it is preposterous to mix what is earthly with what is heavenly. This then we should dismiss from our minds; but hold fast to what is safely believed, according to Pindar—"To all-subduing death man's body must submit, but ever remains the living image of eternity: this alone comes from the Gods;"—thence is its origin;—thither its return;—not *with* the body, but when it is freed entirely from the body,

though they be free from spot or stain, disappear in the darkness below, or are buried in deep oblivion.'—*Josephus de Bello Judaico*, vi. 1. 5. p. 370.

¹ 'Animos per se viventes non poterant mente complecti; formam aliquam figuramque quærebant.'—*Cicero, Tusc. Quæst.* i. 16.

² *Plutarch in Romulo. Vitæ Parallelæ.* Bryan's Edition, Vol. i. p. 75. See *Dissen's Pindar. Threni.* fragm. ii. and his note.

and is separated, and become entirely pure, incorporeal, holy.’

Philosophy thus refined upon the common notion of mankind, and in order to get rid of the absurdities of the vulgar Olympus and Tartarus, either imagined a purely spiritual existence after death—or to escape from the physical difficulties of the separate existence of spirit, denied the immortality of the soul altogether—and, in this manner, philosophy threw a haze of infidelity over the common notions of mankind¹.

¹ To deny this altogether, and to shew that there was no prevalent opinion of a future state among the heathen, has been the object of some modern writers. It can be shewn, no doubt, that a great number of those who reasoned deeply on the subject (without a revelation) came to doubtful conclusions, but this does not shew that the prevalent notion among the vulgar was not in favour of a future life. Take the similar case of the doctrine of Providence. Philosophers of certain schools denied the interference of the Gods in the affairs of men, because the common conception was full of difficulties. Does this prove to us that the mass of mankind were not under the impression of a divine supervision of human occurrences? The whole record of the past leads to an opposite tendency, and we are not staggered by such passages as those of *Tacitus, Annal. vi.*: ‘*Mihi hæc et talia audienti in incerto judicium est, fato ne res humanæ et necessitate immutabili, an forte volvantur, quippe sapientissimos veterum, qui eorum sectam æmulantur, diversos reperies, et multis insitam opinionem, non initia nostra, non finem, non denique homines diis curæ.*’ And it seems to me that the same is true in the case of the doctrine of a Future Life.

Dr Thomas Brown, Lectures on the Human Understanding, Vol. iv. p. 498, talks of the certainty that all men have of being the same thinking beings at the end of the year as they were at the commencement, and says they would laugh at the philosopher who should urge them to doubt it; but with those who entertained the objection the employment of technical terms would render obscure that which had no obscurity till it was darkened with language.

Naturally men have a presentiment of a future life, or of some retribution to man, as man, for his deeds done in the body; but it is hard to see beyond this how such retribution can be justly inflicted on the man, who is made up of spirit, soul and body, when, of these elements, certainly one, the body, has perished and disappeared. Hence, probably, the doubt and hesitation which struggled with the moral conviction, and which made the sanctions of a future life ineffectual among the heathen¹. Though surely we are entitled to take account of the prevalence of the general belief among the people², from the way in which in tragic poetry the agency of the after-

So *Bishop Sherlock* says, ‘the popular belief in a future existence after death, was, though indefinite, a universal and popular idea; and it was only when philosophers began to enquire into it, that it became so flimsy that it was easily broken through.’

Now we may well accept this as the true account of the matter, that the obscure, hazy, floating notion which prevailed before the Christian religion was promulgated, was like the glimmering of an ignis fatuus, but yet was certainly a portion of the belief of the vulgar, and that it got refined into nothing by the scepticism of the philosophical, and therefore that the Christian revelation was most certainly one which brought life and immortality to light in a full and general sense, without supposing such total darkness on the subject as some would have us conclude.

¹ Although perhaps of those who disbelieved we may take the account of Octavius (*Minucius Felix*, § 34), ‘Non ignoro plerosque conscientia meritorum nihil se esse post mortem magis optare quam credere, malunt enim penitus extinguui, quam ad supplicia reservari.’—See *Hierocles on the Verses of Pythagoras*, p. 164. *Clementis Recog.* Lib. v. fol. 95. See *Gronovius’* ed. of *Minucius Felix*, p. 359.

² *Longinus apud Eusebii Præp. Evang.* Lib. xv. p. 822, ed. Paris: καὶ οὐδὲ τοὺς ποιητὰς αἰσχυνοῦμεθα, οἳ, καίπερ ἀκριβῆ συνέειν τῶν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχοντες, ὅμως τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς ἐπινοίας τῶν

life is so constantly insisted upon, and the references to those below are so many, and various, and influential, on the actions of the personages represented¹, and also from the way in which philosophers justify sacred rites and the sanctity

ἀνθρώπων, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἐπινοίας τῶν Μουσῶν, ἢ κινεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ταῦτα πέφυκε, σεμνότερα εἰρήκασι περὶ αὐτῶν (nempe ψυχῶν).

¹ Dr Thomas Brown in his *Lectures on the Human Understanding* [following out the ideas of Cicero (*Tusc. Quæst.* i. 14, 15), and Tertullian (*De Test. Animæ* ii. 5)] shews that the desire of glory, as a mere emotion, supposes to a certain degree immortality of the human being. We extend into futurity the conception of our consciousness, and this is in some degree an assumption of the question. Now nobody can deny that the love of glory was most characteristic of the ancients; and it would seem strange if in their case there was not some dim connexion between this feeling, and a consciousness of future life of some kind.

The same author has beautifully expressed the idea one naturally entertains of the existence of the thinking principle, after death has changed our bodies :

‘If our material frame be not *thought* itself, but only that which has a certain relation to the spiritual principle of thought, so as to be subservient to its feelings and volitions, and to perform the beautiful functions of life, as long as the relation, which He who established it made to depend on a certain state of the corporeal organs, remains, it is as little reasonable to conclude from the decay or change of place of the particles of the organs essential to the mere state of relative subserviency, that the Spirit united with those organs has ceased to exist, as it would be to conclude that the musician to whom we have often listened with rapture has ceased to exist, when the strings of his instrument are broken or torn away. It no longer indeed, pours on our ear the same delightful melodies, but the skill which poured from it those melodies, has not perished with the delightful sounds themselves, nor with the instrument that was the organ of enchantment. The enchanter himself without whom the instrument would have been powerless, exists still, to produce sounds as delightful; and in the intervals of melody, the creative spirit, from which the melody originally flowed, can delight itself with remembered or

of the oath, as useful¹. If Pericles is made to omit in his funeral oration, all topics of consolation which could be derived from the knowledge of the future state, yet we may surely attribute this to the scepticism of the philosophical historian, since we find the poet of the Olympic games suggesting in his *Consolatorium*², the fact of the eternal living shade still being left, and there being a dispensation of rewards and punishments to men hereafter according to their deserts, and that treatises of rhetoric make the reference to the future state a commonplace of consolation to mourners³.

It has been said, that there is no proof that such opinion⁴ of a future life (for knowledge it

imagined airs which exist only as remembered or imagined, and are themselves, as it were, a part of the very spirit which conceives them.'—*Dr Brown*, Vol. iv. p. 492, *On Immortality of the Soul*.

¹ *Cicero de Legibus*, ii. 7. 'Utiles esse autem opiniones has quis neget, cum intelligat quam multa firmentur jurejurando, quantæ salutis sint fœderum religiones; quam multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit,' &c.

² See the passage quoted above in the extract from *Plutarch*, p. 22.

³ *Dionysius of Halicarnassus* in the *Ars Rhetorica*, c. 6. Μέθοδος Ἐπιταφίῳν, § 5, directs the orator not to omit the proper reference to the immortality of the soul, ἐπὶ τέλει δὲ περὶ ψυχῆς ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἀθάνατος καὶ ὅτι τοὺς τοιούτους ἐν θεοῖς ὄντας ἄμεινον εἰκὸς ἀπαλλάττειν.

⁴ See *Mosheim's* conclusion in his Latin Notes to his translation of *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, Vol. ii. c. 5, § 3, 'Disciplinam Recentiorum Platonicorum magnam partem nil esse nisi cumulum opinionum popularium ad præcepta philosophorum veterum Pythagoræ inprimis et Platonis, accommodatarum.' Especially he notices this with regard to opinions about the soul, and he quotes Plotinus as maintaining that the old opinions and the teaching of the

could certainly not be called) was at all influential; I fear that if under the clearer light of the Gospel we were to try to ascertain how influential the constant proclamation of the future life and the resurrection are in reality, we should scarcely find the result produced, corresponding to what the certainty, distinctness and positiveness of the truth would induce us to expect: men now cling to life present, with much the same horror of the future life as Homer puts into the mouth of Achilles¹, who prefers the meanest lot on earth to the glories of Elysium—a passage, by the way, which Plato², in his *Republic*, proposes to expunge from the *Odyssey*, as unworthy of a place therein. And in such cases as the great plague at Florence, the reign of terror in France, and the plague of London, we have records of recklessness, not surpassed by the similar records of the desperation of men at Athens during the plague; though in the former cases immortality and life had been brought to

ancient mysteries were always to be preserved, *Ennead.* II. Lib. IX. c. 6, p. 704; he says it is the part of wise men to be *εὐμενῶς δεχομένων τὰ ἐκείνων ὡς παλαιότερων καὶ ἂ καλῶς λέγουσι παρ' ἐκείνων λαβόντας, ψυχῆς ἀθανασίαν, νοητὸν κόσμον, Θεὸν τὸν πρῶτον, &c.* It is assumed here that the immortality of the soul was a commonly received tenet. *Plato* also, in *Cratylus*, p. 263, refers to the popular view of the immortality of good men's souls, quoting *Hesiod. Op. et Dies*, 121. See *Maximus Tyrius*, Diss. xv. and *Ed. Davisii*, p. 553, the notes on the chapter.

¹ Achilles' complaint (*Odyssey*, λ. 487—489) is more like the ridicule of *Lucian*, than the noble sentiments of *Homer*.—See *Lucian. Dialog. Mort.* xv. 1.

² *Plato de Republica* iii. § 1.

light, and in the latter, there was nothing but the hazy indefinite notion of *a* future life, which the human conscience suggested without any help from on High; and if it is shewn that Cicero, who could write learnedly about the immortality of the soul, yet could find no comfort when his daughter's death pressed heavily upon him, in the thoughts of a future state¹; the literature of the last century will shew, that in a Christian country there was much the same kind of neglect of consolation, founded on higher hopes, and sanctioned by certain knowledge.

It seems quite a different question when we attempt to shew that the heathen had no *sufficient* ground for their belief, or persuasion, or opinion, whatever it may be most properly described. Those who maintain that there was a general prevalent notion of a future life do not mean that there was any full and certain knowledge of the subject, but that there was on this point a general prevalence of prejudice in favour of the doctrine of a Future Life, and of moral retribution hereafter, which enables us to argue, that the doctrines of Immortality and the Resurrection have a

¹ *Seneca* comforts *Polybius* about his deceased brother differently, c. 28: 'Ne invidieris fratri tuo: quiescit tandem tutus, tandem æternus est fruitur nunc aperto et libero cœlo; ex humili et depresso in eum emicuit locus, quisquis ille est, qui solutas vinculis animas beato recipit sinu,' &c. See also his letters to *Helvia*, c. 17; *Marcia*, c. 25. But doubtless he could write differently, and speak of annihilation after death.—*Ep.* 54 *ad Lucilium*.—See *Gataker's notes on Antoninus*, p. 142.

lurking conscious persuasion to appeal to, resident in all men's breasts; and in this way, without derogating at all from the undoubted characteristic of the Gospel, that it alone exhibits these great doctrines in clear, definite, and convincing reality; yet, we may, and ought, I think, to maintain that there are evident traces of the want of such a revelation, in these yearnings of man's heart before the Word of God came. The doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body is peculiarly one which meets the exigency of the case, as we discern from Plutarch's reflections what a tendency there is in men to transfer bodily qualities to the spiritual state; and though speculative thinkers may arrive at conclusions on the subject which shall satisfy them that the intellectual and spiritual part of man is the whole man, such an opinion cannot sway the generality of mankind in a religious sense, and is therefore defective.

The Jews, however, certainly had grounds to infer more than a future life. They might have *deduced*, by the aid of subsequent prophecies—even from the Mosaic writings—that there should be a resurrection. Nor, in asserting this, do I think I am at all venturing on the great field of controversy stirred up by the publication of the *Divine Legation of Moses*. Bishop Warburton himself allows that the Resurrection might have been *inferred*¹. He only maintains that it is not *openly* taught: he grants readily that the later Jewish prophets had given strong intimations of

¹ *Whately's Essay, Rev. of a Future State*, p. 64.

an approaching dispensation with a future state, from which those Jews who believed in a Resurrection and Future Life would draw their conclusions. Whether or not they were mistaken in supposing that eternal life was revealed in 'the Scriptures,' it is clear, on our Lord's own shewing, that the Jews did think that they had eternal life in these Scriptures; though generally it must be confessed, that they arrived at no definite or clear conclusion, worthy of the subject on which their speculations were brought to bear.

Upon such uncertainties as these comes the flood of Divine light in the Gospel.

Jesus Christ our Redeemer brings life and immortality to light—clears up the doubts of a Future State, by revealing the Resurrection of the Body, and by abolishing death, which created all the difficulty¹, restores the knowledge that men

¹ This is an expression of Bishop Sherlock. There is a fine passage in *St Chrysostom's Sermon on 1 Cor. xv. 27*, which expresses clearly the connexion between the victory over death and the resurrection: 'But if bodies do not rise again, how are those things true? For the worst enemy of all, death, remains; having wrought whatever he listed. "Nay," saith one, "for they shall sin no more," and what of that? For he is not discoursing here of the death of the soul, but of that of the body? How then is he put down? for victory is this, the winning of those things which have been carried off and detained. But if men's bodies are to be detained in the earth, it follows that the tyranny of death remains, these bodies for their part being holden, and there being no other body for him to be vanquished in. But if this which S. Paul spake of, ensue, as undoubtedly it will ensue, God's victory will appear, and that a glorious one, in His being able to raise again the bodies which were holden thereby. Since an enemy too is then vanquished, when a man takes the spoils, not when he suffers them to remain in the other's possession: but unless

had of a general accountability, and also restores the capacity for rendering the account.

Death came into the world through sin—when, then, sin is abolished and death destroyed, human nature is restored to the original condition in which it was before the Fall; and the faint and glimmering hopes of immortality, which, in the fallen state, were left as witnesses for God in the human breast are now replaced by certain knowledge, full assurance of faith in the Resurrection to eternal life.

Thus, through the Incarnation, the inheritance of incorruptibility is restored to man¹. For this

one venture to take what is his, how can we say that he is vanquished? After this manner of victory doth Christ Himself say in the Gospels, that he hath been victorious, thus speaking, when he shall bind the strong man, then shall he also spoil his goods. Since if this were not so, it would not be at all a manifest victory. For as in the death of the soul, he that is dead is freed from sin (and yet we cannot say that this is a victory, for he is not the victor who adds no more to his wickedness, but he who hath done away the former captivity of his passions), just so in this instance also, I should not call death's being stayed from feeding on the bodies of men a splendid victory, but rather that the bodies heretofore holden by him should be snatched away from him.—*Oxford Translation*, p. 562.

¹ *Julius Firmicus de errore prof. Religionum*, p. 453, iv. 5. Ed. Gronovii: 'Per virginem Mariam ac Spiritum Sanctum Christus natus et immortalitatem accepit et regnum.....Christus Deus calcata morte ad cœlum hominem quem susceperat revocat...Nam post multa tempora verbum Dei humano se miscuit corpori, ut hominem liberaret, ut mortem vinceret, ut fragilitatem humani corporis cum divina immortalitate conjungeret;' and *Strauss* says in the *Leben Jesu*, 'The reconciliation of mankind to the Creator through the Incarnation was so strongly perceived to be the main idea of the New Testament, that *Kant* argues that the Incarnation was a myth invented in order to represent this.'

cause, as we read in the Epistle for the day, He is the mediator of the New Testament; that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. When God now owns as his children those who have passed from our bodily sight, it is that, all being present to Him, and accepted in the Beloved, He looks upon them already as *restored, living*, the sons of God, as having laid hold of the Tree of Life, eaten thereof, and obtained the blessed result, promised by our Lord to all that eat the Bread of Life, and drink of the water that He, the Lord of the new creation, gives.

‘He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever; I will raise him up at the last day.’

‘He that drinketh of the Water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but it shall be in him a well of water, springing up into eternal life.’

In the old dispensation they saw these things afar off; in the new, they are seen clearly, and apprehended distinctly by faith; and hereafter, in the actual fruition of the Godhead, we shall see face to face, and apprehend that for which we have been here apprehended. Thus, a dim, indistinct foreboding of a future life is succeeded by a clear knowledge of it, and is to be finally followed by actual enjoyment thereof. ‘As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.’ Made sons of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the

kingdom of heaven, we shall realise in all its extent the truth, that God is the God of the living and not of the dead, if we cling to the life imparted to us in the new creation, and do not relapse into the deadly state of sin and godless apathy.

And as Christ rose from the dead, and thereby ensured to us *our* resurrection, so ought we now to walk in newness of life. Let us take heed that we do this daily—our present life is as it were the childhood of a limitless manhood. Futurity, in its grand and comprehensive sense, should ever be present to our minds, with the solemn conviction that the tints of the scene that awaits us are now being painted in by our own hands. If all our energies are wasted in the empty and fast-fading attractions of life present, the picture beyond is nothing but a dreary blank, and thoughts of it must be dark and depressing; but if we will now, by the help of God's Holy Spirit, rise to higher and holier aims, if now we mould our faculties, and form ourselves for the state in which all that is carnal, terrestrial, is done away; then, bright and glorious are the anticipations we may form—and, through Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, we shall pass into the Divine Presence to those things which God hath prepared for them that love Him—things that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and the conception of which has never yet entered into man's heart.

LECTURE II.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 44.

There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.

DIM was the revelation of a resurrection under the elder covenant of God with man, and dark and doubtful the conclusions to which un-enlightened Reason led the enquirer. But there was yet a glimmering of the truth—that all mankind must stand at the bar of an unerring Judge, and hereafter hear the sentence of approval or condemnation for the deeds done in the body.

The Æra of our Redemption is the coming forth in clear and distinct tones of the message from on High, to give solid grounds for this wavering persuasion; and, while pointing out the way to escape wrath to come, to bring us in awful exactness, and with certainty, the tidings of our own personal Individual Resurrection to an endless life of happiness, or of misery.

In reading the New Testament, to learn from it what God has been pleased to reveal to us, we must keep in mind that it never could be the intention of these writings to refer to philosophical difficulties, or to meet the captious. Though it be true that the wise are taken in their own craftiness, and there are deep things of God neces-

sarily involved in the Divine message, yet the Bible in its practical teaching, and in all those didactic parts which specially are meant to influence the conduct and disposition of men, must be taken as a plain book, addressed to men of ordinary capacity. They who will be wise in all things relating to the spiritual, and the future, which are beyond the ordinary limits of human cognizance, must not forget that S. Paul tells the Corinthians, that not many wise men were called, while the 'common people heard Christ gladly;' and the application of this to our present subject is, that the declarations of holy Scripture on the facts of a Resurrection, must be received as they were written, in their plain, simple, natural sense. All mankind are to be restored again to life—and this life is to be in the body. 'The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation' (S. John v. 29, 30); and S. Paul, in a passage quoted before (Acts xxiv. 15), expresses his concurrence in the general expectation of a resurrection from the dead, 'both of the just and unjust.' It has been said, that these are the only two places of the New Testament where it is distinctly and expressly asserted, that the Resurrection of the body shall include both just and unjust. But the doctrine is referred to in many other parts of Scripture, and in such a way as to

shew that it was generally taught and believed in the time of the writers. It is involved also in the idea, that human nature is restored by the Incarnation; for in this sense it may be true that 'Christ is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe;' and as S. Paul writes to Timothy, that God is quickening or regenerating (ζωογονοῦντος) 'the whole of the creation.' (See Rom. viii. 19—22.) In consequence of the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, death, and he that had the power of death, are destroyed—the element of incorruptibility is restored to all the sons of men. After this resurrection, the second death, spoken of by S. John, is the portion of the wicked, and everlasting life the portion of the just.

We have on the present occasion to insist on the manner in which the Scripture speaks of the Resurrection—the way in which it is to be accomplished. 'It is,' says S. Paul (Rom. viii. 11), '*a quickening of our mortal bodies*:' ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν. These words Calvin restricts to the sanctification of believers; but almost all other expositors agree in reading here a reference to the resurrection—so that it is this *mortal body* which is to be quickened, or restored to life.

Adopting strictly the idea herein contained, theologians have too positively asserted, that it is absolutely necessary, for the verification of the Divine Promise, that the very same substance which constituted the human body at the time of its dissolution, should be re-collected, and the

corporeal frame be reconstructed out of the particles which have turned into dust.

Thus, Bishop Pearson¹: ‘Whatsoever we lose in death is not lost to God; as no creature could be made out of nothing but by Him, so can it not be reduced unto nothing but by the same; though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the chambers of nature; and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy, by their separation, to be reunited when and how he pleaseth.’ And, after giving reasons for the necessity of the raising again of the same flesh—from the words of Scripture, from the use of the word resurrection, from the assertion that this resurrection is out of the grave, from the nature of just retribution in the judgment, from the fact of certain men not dying but being translated, and from actual examples of dead men raised to life miraculously already—he concludes, by asserting, that ‘the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored: whatsoever alteration shall be

¹ *Exposition of the Creed*, Vol. I. pp. 631, 648.

made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance, but of their qualities.’

And Dr Barrow¹: ‘It is congruous in justice that the bodies which did partake in works of obedience and holiness, or of disobedience and profaneness (which, in S. Paul’s language, “were either slaves to impurity and iniquity, or servants of righteousness unto sanctification,”) should also partake in suitable recompences; that the body which endured grievous pains for righteousness, should enjoy comfortable refreshments; that which wallowed in unlawful pleasures should undergo just torments.’

And Grotius²: ‘Christ has promised eternal life, not only to the soul, but to the body; and most justly; for the body, which for the Divine law must often suffer inconvenience, tortures, and death, should not be without a recompense. Who can say that God is ignorant of the places, distant from one another though they be, where are the parts of the substance of human bodies, or that He has not the power to bring them back, and recompose and do the same in His universe which the chemist can do in his laboratory, viz. to collect together things which have affinity, though they be separate?’

And Whitby³: ‘I argue for the resurrection

¹ *On the Creed, Art. Resurrection of the Dead.*

² *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ, Lib. II. § 11.*

³ *Preface to Commentary on First Epistle to the Corinthians.*

of the same body thus : If the Scripture teacheth that there shall be a quickening, by raising up our mortal bodies ; a redemption by the resurrection of our bodies ; a changing of our bodies at and by the resurrection into the likeness of Christ's glorious body ; it seems sufficiently to say that there shall be a resurrection of that which before was mortal ; and a change by it of the same body which was vile or humble ; and a redemption by it from corruption of the same body which was formerly in bondage to corruption ; for all this must be said of the same body, or not of the same body ; if of the same body, then the same body must be raised ; and if not of the same body, then of another ? And how then is it said of *our* body ? How can those other bodies be τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, *your* mortal bodies ? How can the redemption of them be τοῦ σώματος ὑμῶν ? the change of them, the change τοῦ σώματος ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, of *our* mortal vile bodies ?

And Archbishop Tillotson : ‘ I take the article of the resurrection in the strictest sense for the raising of a body to life, consisting of the same individual matter that it did before.’

It is needless to do more than refer to the names and passages of ancient Christian writers who have held the same¹, or to multiply instances

¹ *Sti Clementis Ep. II. ad Corinthios*, § 9. *Hermas. Simil. v. § 7.* *Tertullian. Apol.* § 48. *Minucii Fel. Octav. p. 79.* *Sti Augustini Sermo cclvi. in diebus Paschalibus*, § 2, ed. Benedict. Tom. VII. pp. 1055, 6. *St Chrysostom, Homily XLII. on 1 Cor. xv.*

in which orthodox writers in the Church have maintained the necessity of the revivification of the same body which died, from the earliest times to the present. It is well known that such was ever reputed a necessary part of our belief. The opposition to it which arose in past ages was on different grounds from what we now hear alleged. The opinion of the inferiority of the body, which ancient reasoners held, was the chief objection against admitting the tenet of its reconstruction for an eternal future life; and this opinion they held in common with the ancient philosophers, who would not allow that the body was at all necessary to individuality. They thought the body the prison of the soul; that it was a punishment to be tied unto it¹. They said, We in reality are dead, and our body is a tomb. Some say that the body is the tomb of the soul, as if the soul were now buried in it; and Socrates, in the *Gorgias*², repeats the same. Sextus Em-

LI. § 13. (p. 599, Oxf. Translation). *St. Augustin, Sermo cclxiv. in die Ascensionis, § 5, Tom. vii. p. 1078. Idem, de Civitate Dei, Lib. xxii. c. 20. Symbolum Damasi, p. 14 in the Sylloge Confessionum. Sophronius apud Photium, ccxxxi. in his Synodical Letter. Exordium to the Canons of the Council of Worms, A.D. 868.*

¹ 'Corpus hoc animi pondus et poena est, permanente illo urgetur, in vinculis est.'—*Seneca, Ep. 65.*

Καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ ὄντι τεθνάμεν, καὶ τὸ μὲν σώμα ἐστὶν ἡμῶν σῆμα.—*Jamblichus Protrept. Adh. c. 17.*

Καὶ γὰρ σῆμα τιές φασιν αὐτὸ εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς τεθαμμένης ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι.—*Plato in Cratylo, p. 275, E.*

And other passages are quoted in *Suicer's Thesaurus*, ii. 1212.

² § 104, *Ed. Heindorf.*—*Sextus Empiricus, iii. 24. Clem. Alex. Stromata, iii. p. 434.*

piricus and Clement of Alexandria quote Heraclitus as affirming, that during life the human soul was dead and buried within us, but that at death our souls should revive and live¹.

Now men who entertained such opinions as these were of course ready to mock when a stranger coming among them preached of the resurrection of the dead²: the idea was hateful to them: and the philosophical among the Jews seem to have held the same, or similar opinions, of the unworthiness of the body,—acting as if it were a clog to the soul. The Son of Sirach says, ‘The corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind

¹ There is a curious passage in *Athenæus* (*Deipnosophistarum*, Lib. iv. c. 45, Vol. II. p. 102, *Schweigh.*), where *Carneius* argues against suicide from fear of the penalty of a future life, as being commonly held. *Carneius* says to *Nicion*: ‘Euxitheus the Pythagorean (as Clearchus the Peripatetic reports in his second Book of Lives) used to say that men’s souls were tied to the body and to the earthly life, for a penalty: and that God had decreed that if they would not remain there, till he spontaneously set them free, they should fall into more numerous and more grievous calamities. Therefore all men, fearing these threats of the Gods, fear to go unbidden out of this life, and await graciously the death of old age, being persuaded that that liberation of the soul takes place with the will of the Gods.’ Casaubon’s note on this passage is this: ‘There was an opinion of many ancient philosophers that the soul was contained in the present body as in an *Ergastulum*, and on that account called *δέμας* from *δέδεμενον*, and life *βίος*, quasi *βία* by force.’ *Themistius*. τοῦτο γὰρ δέμας καλοῦσιν ὡς δεδεμένης ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνταῦθα παρὰ φύσιν. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν ᾧ πέφυκεν εἶναι, κατέχεται βία, καὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι τὴν τε βίαν ταύτην παραγάγοντες ὠνόμασαν βίον, ὥσπερ οἶμαι τὴν ἐσπέραν Ὀμηρον ἔσπερον.

² See *Origen. c. Celsum*. I. *Arnob.* ii. p. 42. *Lucian.* in *Peregriu.* cp. *Plin.* vii. 55. *Minucius F.* pp. 96, 97.

which museth upon many things.' S. Paul refers to the same idea in writing to the Corinthians when he speaks of the burden of the body. And the general objection made to the resurrection of the body on this ground it is his object to meet in that portion of Holy Scripture from which the text is taken.

He here asserts that a change passes upon the body at its rising again, and that it is no longer to be liable to those infirmities which made its revivification an intolerable idea.

The objections, however, which men had felt were not silenced by this exposition of the Apostle, and others gradually were brought forward.

We find *Celsus*¹ affirming, that those who have died in old time should put on again their own same flesh out of the earth is a hope of worms, most hateful and abhorrent, as well as a thing impossible. God cannot do *αισχρά*, things disgraceful; He will not do that which is against nature; and God neither would nor could exhibit again, in an irrational manner, that flesh which abounds in defects not fit even to be mentioned².

*Marcus Antoninus*³ more modestly asserts that, if it were just, it would not be impossible: but he argues on the assumption of there being no such thing against its justice; and justifies the

¹ *Apud Origenem*, Lib. v. p. 240.

² See *S. Augustin. Sermo CCXLII. in diebus Paschalibus*, § 7,— he ascribes to Porphyry the saying 'Corpus est omne fugiendum.'

³ *M. A. Antonini Meditationes*, Lib. XII. § 5.

eternal destruction of the body in death as a determination of the Gods.

Athenagoras, in his treatise *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, shews us adversaries who enlarged the sphere of their objections. The impossibility of the resurrection was then grounded not only on its being unjust, or unworthy of the Deity, but because the parts of man might form the parts of other animals, and possibly of other men also—an objection which is not only noticed by this author, but also by *S. Augustine*, in the 22nd Book of the *City of God*.

And *Minucius Felix* represents Cæcilius as ridiculing the idea of supposing a general destruction of the visible system of the universe, and yet maintaining a promise of eternal duration to those who have now died and perished¹.

Ancient heretics, as well as heathen philosophers and opponents of Christianity, seem to have held the same opinion as to the impossibility of the resurrection of the body². In recounting

¹ *Minucii Felicis Octavius*, c. 11, *Ed. Gronov.* p. 103.

² They also held that the resurrection was spiritual only, and meant the being delivered from sins. Thus *S. Chrysostom* represents the doctrine of the Manichees. *Sermon on 1 Cor. xv. 3*, and *S. Augustin. contra Faustum*, Lib. iv. *ad finem*, Lib. xi. c. 3.

They said (*S. Augustin. de Hæres.* § 46), ‘Christ did not come to deliver bodies, but the souls of men.’ See *Epiphanius*, LXVI. § 86, 87. Their arguments, as well as those of the Gnostics, were derived from the corrupt nature of all material substance. See note of translator of *S. Chrysostom’s Homilies on 1 Corinth.* Oxford Translation, p. 552, who explains clearly the argument used by S. Paul, as applied by S. Chrysostom to the Manichees: ‘If the word resurrection

the errors of the Marcionites, Irenæus (I. 29) says that they taught their adherents that future salvation was of the soul only, and that the body forsooth could not possibly share in this salvation because it was formed of the dust of the ground. Among the Basilidian tenets likewise was this: that the soul alone could be saved; for the body by its own nature is corruptible (Iren. I. 23). Against this opinion of the impossibility of the resurrection of the body from the nature of things, Irenæus argues in his fifth book, and alleges that it is heretical to maintain that the body is not capable of being made incorruptible ('*carnem non esse capacem incorruptibilitatis*'), because the Body of Christ is communicated to all the faithful. The Gnostic heretics would all, more or less, have rejected the idea of resurrection in consequence of the character which they attributed to all material substance.

At the time of the Reformation the Anabaptists and Libertines denied the resurrection of the body after death, restraining it to a spiritual sense, of the resurrection from sin to a state of grace; and they maintained that this resurrection *only* is meant in diverse passages of Holy Scripture, together with the life of the soul, which they allowed to be immortal. They said that the

means only liberation from sin, the resurrection of Christ and our resurrection are no longer terms implying one another, as S. Paul evidently uses them, 1 Cor. xv. 18. For Christ by his divine nature cannot sin; it doth not therefore follow that if we be not raised, Christ is not risen.'

resurrection was past already, as did Hymenæus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18), and that the soul was an immortal spirit existing in heaven for ever, as Calvin tells us in his *Instructio Adversus Libertinos*, c. 22. And Peter Martyr¹ also informs us that they referred the resurrection to the souls of men only².

In more modern times the objection to the resurrection of the same body that died has been made to depend on the constant change going on in men; so that it is said in a short period of time all the particles of the system have disappeared, and been replaced by others; and therefore, that the restoration of the same body that died cannot be any answer to the objection made in old times of the injustice of a man sinning in one body, and being punished in another. If, it is said, according to the doctrine of the Church, justice demands that the same body should be raised which formed part of the man, while on earth he obeyed or transgressed, how is this just economy secured by giving him back a body which was only in its substance his during a portion of his life³?

¹ *Peter Martyr, Loc. Commun. Class iii. c. 15, n. 4.*

² The Quakers have been accused of denying the Resurrection, but *Barclay, Apology*, p. 373, expressly denies it. There was a sect in Holland headed by *Henry Nicolaus*, of whom *Hornbeck* reports, vi. p. 397, that he taught there was no resurrection of the body after death, but that all resurrection was in this life, viz. resurrection from sin to holiness.

³ See the objection of *Cacilius* in the *Octavius*, which is of a

There are, then, objections of two general classes—those which have their root in the feeling of the unworthiness of the body, and which seek a support out of the Scriptures for some spiritual meaning of the resurrection, because it is written, ‘Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, and corruption cannot inherit incorruption;’ and—those objections, which, from the physical fact of the constant change in the body, assume that identity of substance cannot have anything to do with the question.

The first difficulty ought to be met by shewing that the Scriptures teach us that there is a change to be made in man; that the spiritual, or resurrection-body, is free from the infirmities and impurity of the natural, or animal body.

The second must be met by ascertaining what is meant by *identity*, and how far such change is compatible with it.

In the present Lecture we may collect what the Scripture tells us of the resurrection-body, shewing that it obviates completely all the objections which have been urged against the resurrection from the weakness and defects of our present natural frames.

We cannot but notice, in the first place, that S. Paul, while adhering positively to the assertion that we are to expect the resurrection of the body, does yet tell us of most important differences

similar kind, p. 25: ‘Ipso corpore? Sed jam ante delapsus est. Alio corpore? Ergo homo novus nascitur, non prior ille reparatur.’

which are to exist between the risen body and the bodies we now have. He compares the present life and the future life to the seed-time, and the life of the future plant—death being the limit of the two states—and points out that, as there are bodies of different kinds to ours which may not outwardly be less dissimilar than the plant and the seed, so there are bodies fitted for heaven, as well as bodies fitted for earth. So ought we to think of the resurrection of the dead. And confining himself to the case of the resurrection of the just, he goes on to say that the body which is here in a state of liability to corruption, degradation, and weakness, shall hereafter exist in the state of incorruption, glory, and power. In the present state it is an animal, or natural body, one in which the $\psiυχῆ$ is the dominant power (the epithumetic part of the soul, according to Plato). In the future state it shall be a spiritual body, in which the $πνεῦμα$ is supreme; ‘for as there is a natural body, so there also is a spiritual body;’ the previous analogies having prepared his hearers for the fact that bodies may exist in very different conditions. He then refers to the Old Testament for the proof of the condition of Adam as the representative of fallen, unrenewed nature, and compares it with the condition of Christ, the Head of the new creation. The regeneration of human nature is the establishment of the ascendancy of the $πνεῦμα$, or spiritual principle, in the place of the $\psiυχῆ$, or animal

principle. Adam, as representing mankind in general, has a body in which the mundane principle predominates, being formed of the dust of the earth, and his descendants share in these qualities. Those who in the new creation are partakers with Christ, in like manner shall inherit the heavenly spiritual body. It is quite certain that we have our lot with Adam in the natural body, he being our forerunner according to the flesh. So also shall it be as certain that Christians shall have the heavenly body through their incorporation with Christ Jesus. The change is absolutely necessary: for the corruptible—that which has the property of becoming corrupt—cannot inherit, *i. e.* cannot, in the natural order of things, succeed to a property of becoming incorrupt. Corruption cannot put on incorruption; and therefore a change must be made which shall render the former what it was not before; and therefore we *shall* ALL be changed.

Here, then, is the ground of which ancient heretics availed themselves. Since S. Paul says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, how can that flesh and blood which decayed in the earth be raised again to the incorruptible state?

The answer is, that ‘flesh and blood,’ and the property of liability to corruption, must be distinguished. By the former we may understand the carnal propensities of the man¹, or, if the context

¹ *S. Augustin. Sermo cccclxii. de Resurrectione*, § 14, ed. Bened. Tom. VII. p. 1424, and § 17, p. 1426, and § 21, p. 1430.

be supposed absolutely to require a material sense in the words—that organization which is connected with the passions; and there are reasons of very considerable importance connected with the nature of man, both moral and spiritual, which indicate and require changes¹. The animal frame is not only in its present state the inlet, but the instrument of temptation, and a prompter to sin. It is in this present life a minister of sin; and those qualities in it by which the communication of objects of temptation with the soul of man is kept up, and which give rise to sinful tendencies, must therefore be excluded. The state of happiness cannot be one of temptation, and therefore the body can be no longer the instrument of temptation, either through natural passions or through infirmities.

Our Lord's answer to the Sadducees is very explicit on this point.

'The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels².'

¹ Τὰ νῦν ἐν σοὶ φθαρτὰ καὶ χείρω ἐπὶ τὸ ἀφθαρτον καὶ κρεῖττον μεταστοιχειωθήσονται.—*Theophylact*.

² The idea of equality with the angels is one found in several authors. *Whitby* quotes *Jamblichus apud Stob. Rel.* p. 144, who (very probably from this place however) says the souls of good men shall be converted when they leave the body εἰς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀγγελικὰς ψυχὰς—and a passage is also quoted from *Hierocles*, τοὺς ἐν τοῖς θείοις γένεσι συντεταγμένους ἀνθρώπους σέβειν ὁ λόγος παραίνει τοὺς

It seems most reasonable to interpret the words ‘flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven,’ in connexion with these words of our Saviour; to understand therefore thereby, as we are here taught, that those natural passions which are essentially necessary in this life, both for the preservation of individuals and of races, will not exist in the resurrection-body. The word *ψυχικὸς* is translated *sensual* in the third chapter of S. James, and 15th ver. : ‘This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, *sensual*, devilish;’ and again, in the 19th verse of the Epistle of S. Jude; and therefore when S. Paul speaks of the natural body, *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, we are led to understand that he refers to a body in which the animal passions are implanted.

There is also another argument to be alleged by which we can shew that the qualities of the resurrection-body are very different from those of the natural body, and by which the interpretation of the words ‘flesh and blood’ is cleared.

We are directed by the apostolical Epistles to look to the risen body of our Saviour for a knowledge of what the spiritual body of the resurrection shall be¹; and this too in more than one place. S. Paul, writing to the Philippians, speaks of our Lord thus : ‘Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.’ And S. John : ‘It doth not yet appear what we

ισοδαιμόνας, καὶ ἰσαγγέλους, καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἥρωσι ὁμοίους, p. 52, ed. Londini, 1742.

¹ *S. Augustin. Sermo cccclxii. de Resurrectione, §§ 10, 17, 27.*

shall be ; but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him ; for we shall see Him as He is¹.’ And S. Paul to the Corinthians : ‘ We shall bear the image of the Heavenly, *i. e.*, the Lord from heaven.’ And David, speaking prophetically, and perhaps not himself aware of the meaning of his words : ‘ When I awake up after thy likeness I shall be satisfied with it.’

Now the body of our Lord after His resurrection was certainly not one which could be described as entirely ethereal, whatever changes had passed upon it, since He Himself says, ‘ Behold my hands and feet, that it is I myself ; handle me and see : for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.’ And yet our Lord seems to have had the power of transferring His body at will from one place to another² ; the power of altering its outward form, so as to prevent persons recognising Him, while yet retaining the power of compelling recognition. There is something singular at first in the fact, that the women, whose affection to our Saviour prompted them to go early to the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, should have been unable to recognise Him ; but we see a hesitation in almost all the

¹ See S. Augustin’s discussion of this passage, as it bears on the qualities of the resurrection-body, in the Epistle to *Paulina*, *de Videndo Deo*, 21, 49, and 22, 51 ; and in that which follows it in the Benedictine edition, the *Commonitorium* to *Fortunatianus*, bishop of *Sicca*.

² ‘ *Credere enim debemus talia corpora nos habituros, ut ubi velimus quando voluerimus, ibi simus.*’—*S. August. Sermo* CCXLII. *in diebus Paschalibus*, § 5.

accounts. When He shewed himself to the assembled apostles, to the disciples walking to Emmaus, to the disciples when fishing—in all the recognition of Christ was not *immediate*. This indicates some outward change; and for this, perhaps, the three chosen disciples were prepared by the mysterious event of the transfiguration¹, in which they knew of our Lord's identity, notwithstanding a great change in His outward appearance (*μετεμορφώθη*). And therefore we are by these facts prepared for some general change which passes on the whole body. In the case of S. Luke's Gospel, it is mentioned that our Lord did eat before them. Some suppose the same implied in the account in the last chapter of S. John; and S. Peter says expressly, in the 11th chap. 41st ver. of the Acts, 'that the apostles eat and drank with Him after He rose from the dead.' We cannot suppose this to be for any other purpose than to prove to them the truth of His corporal existence². It has been noticed that our Lord says 'flesh and bones,' in speaking of Himself, not 'blood;' the blood being the principle of *animal* life. The car-

¹ *S. Chrysostom.* Tom. III. p. 488, *Hom. de Futuræ Vitæ Deliciis*:
 ... ἀνελθὼν ἐν τῷ ὄρει μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,
 παρανοίγων αὐτοῖς τῶν μελλόντων τὴν δόξαν, καὶ ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι καὶ
 ἀμυδρῶς ἐπίδεικνὺς οἶον ἔσται τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἡμέτερον.—See also *S. Au-*
gustin. Epistola CXLIX. ad Paulinum, § 31.

² *S. Augustin. Sermo CCCLXII. De Resurrectione*, ed. Bened.
 Tom. VII. p. 1422: 'In terra officia humana servavit, ut persuaderet
 hoc resurrexisse quod sepultum erat. Numquid autem et in cælo
 talis cibus est? Nam et angelos officia humana in terra legimus ex-
 secutos;' and he gives the instance of the angels appearing to Abra-
 ham (Gen. xviii. 9), and he goes on to shew that as the reason of our

nal mortal element seems to be entirely banished from the glorified body, and the crowning miracle of the ascension proves that the Saviour's human body was of a nature very different indeed to the present.

I have said that the expressions used by our Lord would exclude the idea of an ethereal or attenuated substance in His risen body; but this also seems to be an accidental, not an essential property. It is said that He became invisible at will; and this is not inconsistent with substance remaining; for we have instances in the natural world of substances existing as solids and in the gaseous state without losing their identity¹.

The only result, however, to which I wish at present to arrive is, that there is sufficient evidence of change in the resurrection-body to ob-

Lord's compliance cannot have any place when men shall rise again, there is no ground to conclude from this example, the existence of carnal appetites in the Resurrection-body.

'Quod manducavit potestatis fuit non egestatis.'—*Sermo cxxlii. in diebus Paschalibus*, § 2.

¹ *Origen*, and after him, *Grotius*, thought that there was an intermediate state of our Lord's body during the forty days; but this seems to have very little to support it. The opinion which I have reported above, is according to what *Mosheim* writes in his note on *Cudworth*, v. 3. 20 (4to. ed. p. 442): 'Quod e discipulorum suorum conspectu repente Christus evanuit id argumento quidem est, corpus ejus novis auctum fuisse proprietatibus et veterem deposuisse gravitatem, aut gloriosum fuisse factum; nullo vero modo probat, corpus illud, quod resurgens habuit, aerium et mediæ cujusdam naturæ fuisse.'

The place of *Origen* referred to is *adv. Celsum*, Lib. II. p. 98: Καὶ ἦν γε κατὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ ὡσπὲρ ἐν μεθορίῳ τιῶν τῆς παχύτητος τῆς πρὸ τοῦ πάθους σώματος, καὶ τοῦ γυμνῆν τοιοῦτον σώματος φαίνεσθαι ψυχρῶν and the passage of *Grotius* is *Comment. ad Lucæ Evang.* c. xxiv. 31.

viate all objections which can be drawn from the grossness of matter, from the connexion of material substance with weakness or corrupt tendency¹.

So far only can we maintain that the body of the resurrection is like that in which we now dwell²—that it is capable of recognition; and this in a peculiar sense, of which we must say more when we have to examine the more difficult subject of identity.

We may now refer to some points of much interest, on which the Scriptures do certainly speak, it seems to me, without hesitation or indistinctness.

On the separate existence of the soul there seems to be clear intimation, though whether the soul be completely free from all corporeal concomitant is not so clearly affirmed.

When it is said that all live unto God, that the spirit of man returns to God who gave it, that, in the case of the faithful, to depart is to be with

¹ 'Christianity brought with it not the annihilation but the ennobling and the glorifying of that which peculiarly belongs to human nature; and the de-humanizing idealism of the Gnostics was wholly incompatible with this fundamental principle of Christianity.' *Neander's Church History*, Vol. II. p. 327. (H. J. Rose's Translation.)

² *Aeneas Gazeus*, according to *Dupin's* account of him, seems to have held this: 'Il croit...que les corps ressusciteront en la même forme qu'ils ont eu en ce monde.'—*Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccl.* Tom. IV. p. 280.

S. Augustine has a curious speculation in ch. 15, Book XXII. of the 'City of God.' He supposes that men shall rise with the form which they had when about 30 years of age, because men are then in the prime of life, and because of that being near the age of our Saviour when he died and rose again.

Christ, that the spirit of man goeth upward, that the resurrection is a bringing back of them that are now fallen asleep in Jesus, we can have, it seems to me, little doubt that the Bible means to teach us the truth embodied in the Burial Service of the Church, where we say, ‘With whom do live the souls of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity¹.’

If any objection is made on the ground that incorporeal beings must be without extension, and therefore cannot logically be said to have locality, we must, no doubt, admit a difficulty. But if we are asked, Where are the souls of men after death? such an appeal to our ignorance is only to be met by urging men with the indefinite idea in which they are content to remain with respect to the Deity. If we ask, where is God? and we are told that he is present everywhere, the answer, though true, is indefinite and wanting in any positive idea.

It may be also answered, that, as Holy Scripture favours the idea of a locality for souls of men out of the body², it may to the same extent give reason to suppose that the soul may not be

¹ εἰς τὸ ὀφειλόμενον αὐτοῖς τοπὸν εἰσι παρὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ.—*S. Polycarp. Epist.* § 9. *Justin Martyr, D. Tryph.* p. 223, et passim.

There is a very interesting account of the writers who have argued the question about the sleep of the soul after death in *Archdeacon Blackburn's Works*, Vol. III. but it is one-sided, for the Archdeacon himself believed in the sleep; and he has omitted many writers of repute on the other side of the question.

² *S. Augustine* discusses this question at the end of the 12th Book *De Genesi ad Litteram*.

altogether separated from all material combination; an opinion which the Platonists held, and also many of the ancient Christian fathers. Holy Scripture, though perhaps it cannot be said to teach an extended separate existence of spiritual beings, allows us to presume it. The Apostles supposed on several occasions that they had seen a spirit; and our Lord says, 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.'

There is an impression, amounting often to belief, that seems spread over the world, wherever we can find man, that there may be, that there have been, what are called supernatural appearances. No doubt, in a matter where the imagination is so easily called into play, and where it is so easy to practise deception, innumerable instances have occurred which may be explained on either of these suppositions; but he would be a rash man who should affirm it impossible that such things may be. The Platonists¹, acting on their avowed principle of adopting all that had universality and antiquity in its favour as having a germ of truth, held that the souls of men on leaving the body had another spiritual or ethereal body; that the soul never could be quite deprived of all body; not that the soul always adhered to the same particles, but that it had a property of making a body suitable to itself under any circumstances².

¹ See note on *Lecture I.* p. 26, and *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, v. 3. 19.

² *Porphyrus* in ἀφορμαῖς πρὸς τὰ νοητά, § 32, p. 233, ὡς γὰρ

And with the doctrines of this school Christianity agrees in some particulars, especially in this, that the highest happiness and perfection of human nature does not consist in a separate state of souls ununited to any body¹, and also that it does not consist in the junction of souls to the present gross natural body. As it is not determined in Christianity, it may be urged that there is nothing inconsistent in the idea of the soul between death and the resurrection having some kind of body². Origen³ supposes (and it is a noble idea) that it is a privilege peculiar to the Deity, to live and act alone without vital union with

ἀν διετέθη εὐρίσκει σῶμα, τάξει καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις διωρισμένον; and *Theophrastus* apud *Æneam Gazeum, Dialogo Theophrasto*, p. 54, τοιούτων καὶ τοσούτων ἢ ψυχὴ σωμάτων ἐμπίπλαται, δι' ὧσων καὶ οἷων χωρίων παρέρχεται.

¹ *S. Augustin. de Genesi ad Litteram*, Lib. XII. c. 35, § 58, teaches that the resurrection of the body is necessary to complete the happiness of the soul.

² The εἶδος χαρακτήριζον of *Origen* which belonged to the σῶμα πνευματικόν as well as the σῶμα ψυχικόν. *S. Augustine* however is of a contrary opinion: 'Utrum habeat aliquod corpus, cum de hoc corpore exierit, ostendat qui potest, ego autem non puto.'—*De Genesi ad Litteram*, Lib. XII. c. 32, § 60. It should be observed that this notion is quite distinct from what is ordinarily called *materialism*, or the doctrine that the intellectual faculty is the result of physical organization. *Dr Crombie* in his *Natural Theology*, Vol. II. seems to me to have collected in the clearest form, the arguments from nature on the Immortality of the Soul. Those who have advocated the doctrine of the sleep of the soul, too often are liable to the charge of materialism; but this is not necessarily the case, for the advocates of that doctrine may only maintain that the state of the soul after death is like its state in natural sleep, without entering on the question of its immateriality.

³ *Origenes περὶ Ἀρχ.* Lib. II. c. 2, p. 69, Opp.

any body. If it be an essential property of the soul, that it should impart life to matter, then it is improbable it should be kept separate¹. Tertullian, indeed, seems to go too far in this respect, and make the soul itself material²; but Irenæus preserves the idea of the incorporeal nature of the soul, and yet supposes it to have a sort of figure and character, of a bodily kind, such as it had in this life³. He says our Lord hath most plainly taught us, that not only do souls continue after death without passing from one body into another, but that they preserve the character of the body to which they are joined, and remember what they did here, and what they left undone, and that they have the figure of a man, so that they may be known⁴.

¹ See *S. Augustin. de Civitate Dei*, Lib. XIII. c. 19, and Lib. XXII. c. 27. 'In Lib. XXI. 10, he adduces the case of Dives in illustration of the suffering of demons, supposing that they be not, though of aerial, yet corporeal substance.'—*Notes on Tertullian*, in the Library of the Fathers, *Apology*, c. 48, p. 99.

² *De Resurrectione Carnis*, § 17.

³ So *S. Augustin. de Gen. ad Litteram*, Lib. XII. c. 32, § 62: 'Animam vero non esse corpoream non me putare sed plane scire audeo profiteri; tamen habere posse similitudinem corporis et corporalium omnino membrorum quisquis negat, potest negare animam esse, quæ insomnis videt vel se ambulare, vel sedere, vel hac atque illac gustu aut etiam voratu ferri ac referri, quod sine quadam similitudine corporis non sit.'

⁴ *Irenæus*, II. 62, 3. See *Massuet's Dissertation III. on Irenæus*, Art. 11. § 120.

In another place *Irenæus*, II. 19, 6, compares the figure which he assigns to the soul to the shape of water filling a vessel: 'Non enim angelorum habebit similitudinem et speciem, sed animarum in quibus et formatur; quomodo aqua in vas missa ipsius vasis habebit formam, et jam si gelaverit in eo, speciem habebit vasculi, in quo

And Origen, speaking of S. Thomas's doubts of our Lord's reality, attributes to him a like persuasion, that he supposed he might have seen a spirit, but was determined to satisfy himself of the substantial verity of the Lord's body before he would consent to receive the truth of his resurrection¹.

The substance then of the conclusions to which this exercise should lead are as follows :

1. That the changes which the Scripture teaches us shall supervene in the resurrection-body, are such that they fully meet all objections which can be drawn from the grossness of the present material frame.

2. That, whereas the Scripture allows us to presume the separate existence of spirit, it does not forbid, but may rather be supposed to tolerate, the opinion that the soul thus separate, may have some ethereal or refined substance united to it².

By this means it has been endeavoured to obviate certain objections which have been felt more or less strongly since the first promulgation of Christianity ; and the recapitulation of the answers now, and the conveying of them in plain and modern language, is meant to be proposed as a help to any who may in these days of busy

gelavit ; quando ipsæ animæ corporis habeant figuram ; ipsi enim adaptatæ sunt vasi, quemadmodum prædiximus.'

¹ See *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, v. 3, 27.

² See on this controversy, *Leclerc, Bibliothèque choisie*, Tom. VIII. p. 81 ; and *Mosheim's Notes to his Latin Translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System*, v. 3, 25.

and curious speculation be troubled in their faith.

How are the dead raised up? With what body do they come? What is the promise of Christ's coming? These are questions which will be asked by men as long as the world standeth. They must be answered, and the answer cleared from time to time from such additional difficulties as may be thrown upon it, as far as the holy Scriptures authorize to do so; but we must also, as becomes those whose guiding principle is faith, trust in the truth of Christ our Saviour, make all these speculations in humility, and endeavour to repress our too curious feelings, lest, as S. Augustine says¹, we never rise to the state in which the qualities of the resurrection-body of the just become known to us.

In conclusion, we may fitly notice the congruity of this doctrine of the spiritual body with the general scheme of the Gospel. The body with its organization of parts, suited for the ascendancy of the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, is a fit instrument for man in the state of probation; but if in the contest of the flesh and the Spirit of God which dwelleth within us, the spiritual principle, so supported and strengthened, prevail, then salvation is accomplished; and in the resurrection, the man who has become spiritual, will have this victory con-

¹ 'Quæ sit autem et quam magna spiritualis corporis gratia, quoniam nondum venit in experimentum, vereor ne temerarium sit omne quod de illa profertur eloquium.'—S. *Augustin. De Civitate Dei*, Lib. XXII. c. 21, et seq.

firmed and made sure, by the adaptation of his body fixedly to the empire of the spiritual.

Thus Christ's crucifixion and resurrection are as it were worked out in every Christian in whom the grace of God is effectual. The carnal, or animal, or natural element is crucified and slain, and the spiritual, heavenly, engrafted element is triumphant, and the man is brought out from the state in which he would have been without Christ, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, made free from the law of sin and death. And by this must we now judge of our progress towards our eternal destiny.

There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. The subjective idea of Christianity cannot be expressed by a more apt symbolism. There are in life present, the natural state, and the spiritual state; and as the works of the flesh are manifest as the fruits of the former, so the fruits of the spirit are given to us as the criteria of the latter. By these we may know if God's mercy towards us has been effectual. By these must we judge ourselves, and ascertain whether we are frustrating the grace of God, or whether we are through faith yielding ourselves to the Divine influence which constantly urges us onwards, upwards and forwards, to a loftier scale of being, that having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, we may, according to the wonderful words of S. Peter, be partakers of the Divine nature.

LECTURE III.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 35.

How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?

THE question that next presents itself to the enquirer, about the Scriptural notion of the reviviscence of the human being, is that of identity. We have endeavoured to recapitulate, from sources trustworthy and impartial, what was the idea of a future life before our Saviour brought it to light or made it clear, the progress of the doctrine of the resurrection after the time of the Gospel, and to shew what is the difference between the raised body and the present natural body; and we have now to consider how far the changes we have described as taking place in the body are consistent with sameness of the individual.

In speaking of identity, or sameness, we are met at once with a notion of the extreme vagueness of the term; we are forced to make certain distinctions between the cases to which we apply the word. Even mathematical identity is two-fold; figures of the same form coincide geometrically and are identical; in certain algebraic formulæ the form is different, the real value of expressions the same; here the identity is deductive. And in the physical world, when neither

form nor real substance are wholly the same, we yet do not scruple to speak of the sameness of objects; and the instance which has been made use of most frequently to illustrate this is taken from vegetable growth. The tree which year by year sheds all its leaves, and is renewed throughout its whole structure with its acquired annual increase, we do not hesitate to talk of as the same tree; we do not require, in order to constitute sameness, the actual existence of the same particles only, and in the same relative positions; and when in old age all the interior substance may be decayed and gone, that there may not be any particle in common between the old inhabitant of the forest and what it was when a tender plant, we yet do not object to its being called the same tree. Sameness from year to year does not seem to us a difficulty, but our conception of it is strangely altered when we compare the individual after a lapse of centuries; so that our ideas of identity, or sameness¹, are extremely indefinite, and the question, how much of change is consistent with identity of individuals? is one to which a positive answer cannot be returned. It may be said, that perpetual flux of particles, provided there be a *continuity* in the change, and in the existence of the subject, does in the case of vegetable growth satisfy our notion of identity; but, applied

¹ *Mr Mill (On the Human Mind, Vol. II. p. 127) argues that Same is the name of a certain case of belief, founded either on memory, or testimony, or circumstantial evidence, or on both.*

to the case which we are considering, of the human body, we have a break in this continuity at death, which takes it out of the analogy.

There is no doubt that the popular understanding of the resurrection of the flesh was, that the same particles which composed the perishing body should be reunited to form the risen body; that the actual atoms deposited in the tomb should be the elements out of which the living man, at the resurrection, shall have his body constructed, and those to whom such identity of particles seemed necessary to constitute identity of the man, have a ready answer to all objections, by urging the omnipotence and omniscience of the Deity¹. This reply is sufficient to silence the objectors, if it could be shewn that identity of man *requires* identity of particles. But before we come to this conclusion, it seems reasonable to settle what identity of man really is, and if it can be made clear that the positive sameness of particles has nothing to do with the identity of any individual, then, of course, there is no need to have recourse to an answer, which is one precluding a reply indeed, but which may, in this case, reasonably be received with hesitation, and with an appeal to other ways and works of God; ways which are not as our ways, thoughts which are not as our thoughts.

Even divines who have thought it necessary

¹ This, according to *S. Chrysostom on 1 Cor. xv. 36*, is not the way of S. Paul.

to insist most strongly on the material view of the resurrection, which considers men's bodies will be composed then of the same corruptible matter as they are now; that identical portion of matter being changed in its qualities; have yet spoken in a manner which shews how sensible¹ they were of the difficulty which is involved in bringing into close contact the ideas of change and identity.

Those who will have the same particles restored to the resurrection-body, which were deposited in the tomb, must assume and be allowed these two propositions, that matter is indestructible², and that God knows every atom whereof we are made. Now Bishop Pearson³ defines a resurrection to be 'a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again.' By substantial, he means not accidental, and when he explains the necessity of saying 'which was corrupted,' he proceeds thus, 'things immaterial and incorrup-

¹ Even *S. Augustine, Sermon on Romans vii. 24.* (CLIV.) Tom. VII. p. 741: 'Non enim sic liberaberis de corpore mortis hujus ut hoc corpus non habeas. Habebis sed jam non mortis hujus. *Ipsum erit, sed non ipsum erit.* Ipsum erit quia ipsa caro erit, non ipsum erit, quia mortale non erit.'

² *S. Augustin. Sermo LXXVII.* (CXXVII. Benedictine Ed.) § 15: 'Thou wast made when thou wast not at all; and dost thou not believe that these bones, (for in whatever state, of whatever kind they are, yet they *are*) shall receive the form which they once had, when thou hadst already received what thou hadst not?' p. 568, *Oxford Translation.*

³ *On the Creed:* 'He rose from the dead.'

tible cannot be said to rise again, resurrection implying a reproduction ; and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced.' Now if physiology had been so far advanced in the time of this great divine, that it had been shewn that all organized forms exist rather as the result of peculiar arrangements and affinities between a constantly flowing changeable set of particles, than as permanent juxtaposition of the same particles, it seems clear that he would have restricted his definition to the *form* rather than to the substance of human flesh.

Joannes Clericus (Leclerc) in his notes on Grotius¹, says that if any one object to the author's words, he may be answered that it is not at all necessary that the matter be the same in the actual number of particles, as that which was put into the tomb at man's death. He will be the same man, though his spirit be joined to matter with which it never was joined before, provided only it be the same spirit, not less than it is the same man, who at one time is a decrepit sexagenarian, and formerly an infant in the cradle, though not a single particle of the one may have belonged to the other. The body may be said to rise again when a material body is formed of the clay, exactly like the first, and the same spirit is joined to it. There is therefore no need that we should involve ourselves in difficulties in defending the *ταυτότης* of matter too rigidly.

¹ See the place cited before, *Lecture II.* (p. 39.)

And Whitby¹: ‘I am far from thinking that to the raising of the same bodies it can be requisite that these bodies should be made up wholly of the same particles which were once vitally united to their souls in their former life, without any admixture of any other particle of matter; for were this necessary to the same living body, we could not have the same bodies for a day; and if it be not necessary to make the body continue still the same while we live, it cannot be necessary to make the raised body the same with that which died.’

And Archbishop Tillotson² says: ‘The difficulty of these objections is avoided perfectly by those who hold that it is not necessary that our bodies at the resurrection should consist of the very same parts of matter that they did before; there being no such great difference between one parcel of dust and another; neither in respect of the power of God, which can as easily command this parcel of dust as that to become a living body, and being united to the soul to rise up and walk: so that the miracle of the resurrection will be all one in the main, whether our bodies be made of the very same matter they were before, or not. Nor will there be any difference as to us; for whatever matter our bodies be made of, when they are once reunited to our souls, they will then be as much our own as if they had been made of

¹ *Preface to First Epistle to the Corinthians.*

² *Sermon cXL. Vol. II. fol. Ed. 1717.*

the very same matter of which they consisted before. Besides that the change which the resurrection will make in our bodies will be so great, that we could not know them to be the same, though they were so.'

Without agreeing with all that is here said, it is sufficient to shew that Archbishop Tillotson, who did not himself entertain the opinion which he here quotes as sufficient to obviate all difficulty, allowed it to be a valid answer while he adhered to the more popular persuasion.

There is then no abandonment of high theological precedent, when we hesitate to admit the idea of a resurrection of the same material particles as once formed the man's body. Nor are we inconsistent when we turn to the mental philosophers and ask for their definition of personal identity, in order to prove that no such preservation of the selfsame atomic constituents is at all necessary to secure a resurrection of the same man.

The reasons urged against the popular understanding are :—

1. That sameness does not consist in identity of particles, because it can be shewn that the same man is, at different periods of his life, composed of different particles.

2. That identity of the individual must therefore chiefly be a mental identity.

3. That even if it require identity of particles in any degree, yet additions to or subtractions from them may be made without that identity

being destroyed. And from physical changes viewed as analogies, such as when a piece of ice is converted into steam, we may argue that identity of particles is consistent with change of state to any conceivable extent¹.

Before proceeding to the discussion of these points, we may remark that there is no strength in the argument used by ancient apologists², and reiterated by modern divines, that it is necessary, for purposes of justice, that the same particles of matter should suffer happiness or misery, according to the conduct of the individuals of whom they formed part.

This is untenable, because it is to endow the particles of matter with qualities of desert, or culpability, which can only attach to the moral agent; it extends to the mere instruments of action the guilt of the actor: and though it be said that under the law of Moses we have examples of

¹ Though in a succession of related objects it be in a manner requisite that the change of parts be not sudden nor entire in order to preserve the identity; yet where the objects are in their nature changeable and inconstant, we admit a more sudden transition than would be otherwise consistent with that relation.

² *Tertullian de Testimonio Animæ*, c. 4: 'Necessario tibi substantiam pristinam ejusdemque hominis materiam et memoriam reversuram quod et nihil mali ac boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate, et nulla ratio sit judicii sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit judicii passionem.'—*De Resur. Carnis*, c. 56. *Pearson on the Creed*, Art. *Resurrection of the Dead*. See also *Tertullian's Apology*, c. 48. *Tatian*, c. 6. *Athenag.* 18—22. *de Res.* 14. 5. *Ambrose de Fid. Res.* § 88. *Cyril Jer.* xviii. 19. *Ambr. Exh. Virg.* c. 9. § 59. quoted in the notes to the English Translation of *Tertullian* in the Library of the Fathers.

inanimate or irrational instruments of sin being condemned to destruction¹, which seems to a certain extent to justify the idea of the material wherewith sin is committed, being involved in the condemnation incurred by the sinner; yet most thinking persons will be prepared to admit that the examples thus exhibited must have been designed to teach a dull and gross-minded people the sinfulness of sin, rather than to exhibit a vengeance taken upon material instruments. By means of our present bodies sensations of pain or pleasure may be conveyed to the soul. The risen body may in like manner be made the instrument of this dispensation; the result will be the same, whether the same particles be employed or not. In the sentencing of moral agents we admit the idea of retribution; but to irrational substances this cannot extend. They cannot have any either hateful or commendatory qualities in the sight of the Divine Artificer: there can therefore be no peculiar necessity that material particles should be doomed to particular states from

¹ In the Old Testament. The passage in S. Jude, ver. 22, which appears to point at the same hatred of material substances as we see displayed in instruments of sin under the old covenant, seems not to be rightly translated. See *Dr Peile's* note. He says the ordinary translation would require τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς σπιλωθέντα χιτῶνα—instead of τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα, which he translates, *abhorring even that soiled garment which cometh of the flesh*; that active principle which is still lurking in our earthly members and found in opposition to the heaven-sent and engrafted principle of the Spirit, so that the garment here is taken to mean the depravation of nature which remaineth even in the regenerate. See also *Burnet, De Statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium*, c. ix. p. 197.

their accidental connexion with a particular human body, and if they are, we cannot discern any special object therein, for only sentient beings can be capable of moral retribution, in the sense of feeling or perceiving why they are thus subjected to it; and in the case of the general judgment the punishment, for example's sake, would not have place.

It is also a considerable argument against this view, that by the constant flux of particles in the human body, the individual in the sense thus insisted on, cannot at his death be at all the same as he who years before committed acts deserving punishment; so that in this regard the argument itself would prove that the risen body must contain many more particles than what it had in its composition at the time of death.

It is by reflections such as these that men have been led to the conclusion that it can be of little consequence to personal identity that material particles should be the same. The observations of *Sir Kenelm Digby*, on the *Religio Medici*, contain the following remark: 'Methinks it is a gross conception to think that every atom of the present individual matter of a body, every grain of ashes of a buried corpse, scattered by the wind throughout the world, and after numerous variations, changed peradventure into the body of another man, should at the sounding of the last trumpet be raked together again from all the corners of the earth, and be made up anew

into the same body it was before¹.' And *Dr Thomas Burnet*, in his *Treatise de Statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium* (c. ix. p. 205) writes in the same strain.

In what then consists identity? *Locke* first of all gives us a clear notion of what he had resolved it to be. He himself sums it up in the words, 'Consciousness makes the same person.' That the same immaterial substance or soul, alone, or wherever it may be, or in whatsoever state, makes the same man, he rejects absolutely. This was the conclusion to which *Cicero* had arrived in the *Somnium Scipionis*². 'You are not mortal, but only this

¹ 'Yet if we will be Christians, and rely upon God's promises, we must believe that we shall rise again with the same body that walked about, did eat, drink, and live, here on earth, and that we shall see our Saviour and Redeemer with the same, the very same eyes, wherewith we now look upon the fading glories of this contemptible world.'

'How shall these seeming contrarities be reconciled? If the latter be true, why should not the former be admitted?' He then asks *Lord Dorset* if he think he have now the same eyes and same person as in early youth, and in infancy, and continues, 'How can this body be now called the same as it was forty years ago unless some higher consideration keep up the identity of it?' and he concludes, that the *form* remains, and that matter by itself hath no distinction; and then says, 'It is evident that *sameness, thisness, thatness*, belongeth not to matter by itself (for a general indifference runneth through it all) but only as it is distinguished and individuated by the form, which in our case, whensoever the same soul doth, it must be understood always to be the same matter and the same body.'—*Observations upon the Religio Medici*, by *Sir K. Digby, Knt.* 5th Ed. Lond. 1672, pp. 134—136.

² 'Sic habeto: non esse te mortalem sed corpus hoc; non enim tu is es, quam forma ista declarat: sed mens cujusque is est quisque, non ea figura quæ digito demonstrari potest.'—*Cicero, Somnium Sci-*

body of yours : for you are not the being whom this outward form designates ; each man's *mens* is the man himself, not the form which can be indicated by the finger.' Assuming therefore the necessity of a body, or of the constitution of men remaining as it now is, so that he is a compound being, *Locke* repeats in several places in his chapter on Identity his definition : 'The identity of the same man consists in nothing but a participation of the same continued life, by constantly fleeting particles of matter in succession, vitally united to the same organized body¹;' and we know ourselves to be the same by consciousness. It was objected to *Locke*, as by *Bishop Butler*, that consciousness of personal identity, pre-supposes, and therefore cannot constitute personal identity, any more than knowledge in any other case can constitute truth². Consciousness of past actions does indeed shew us the identity of ourselves, or gives us a certain assurance that

pionis, following *Zeno* (as he says in *Academ. Lib. iv.*): 'Zeno, quasi corporis simus expertes, animum solum complectitur;' and see the *Commentary* of *Macrobius*, *Lib. ii.* Bipont. Ed. Vol. ii. pp. 164-6. *Marcus Antoninus, Med. Lib. xii. 3.* τρία ἐστὶν ἐξ ὧν συνέστηκες, σωματίον, πνευμάτιον, νοῦς· τούτων τὰ ἄλλα μεχρὶ τοῦ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δεῖν, σὰ ἐστὶ τὸ δὲ τρίτον μόνον κυρίως σόν.—*Plato, in Alcibiad. i.* οὔτε τὸ σῶμα, οὔτε συναμφοτέρον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος...λείπεται μηδὲν ἄλλο τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι ἢ ψυχὴν.—*Aristotle, Eth. ix. 4.* δόξειε δ' ἂν τὸ νοοῦν ἕκαστος εἶναι, ἢ μάλιστα. But *Tertullian* recognises the christian truth, *De Resur. c. 33*, 'tam corpus homo, quam et anima;' and *adv. Marcion. i. 24*.

¹ *Essay on Human Understanding*, II. 27. 6.

² In the same way *Hume* objects reasonably to *memory producing* personal identity, it rather *discovers* it. See his *Essays*.

we are the same persons or living agents now which we were at the time to which our remembrance can look back : but still we should be the same persons as we were, though this consciousness of what is past were wanting, though all that had been done by us formerly were forgotten.

The chief defect which Butler, and after him Dr Reid¹, find in Locke's definition, is the want of the introduction of an idea of continuance² and succession. And the latter says, 'Continued uninterrupted existence is necessarily implied in identity, and the proper evidence which we have of it is remembrance.' The remembrance not being necessary to constitute identity, but only necessary to make us aware of our identity; and he concludes the fourth Chapter of his third Essay with the following remark :

'The identity which we ascribe to bodies is not perfect identity; it is rather something which for convenience of speech we call identity. It admits of a great change of the subject, providing the change be gradual, sometimes even of a total change, and the changes which in common language are made consistent with identity, differ

¹ *Dr Reid's Essays*, III. 1.

² 'The grain of wheat is cast into the ground; the full and perfect stem, blade and ear, spring from it; all differing from the original seed in form, size, colour, and in their constituent material particles; yet the continuity of existence is never for a moment interrupted, but whilst minute portions of the substance are successively withdrawn, the gradual substitution and assimilation of others build up the entire plant to the full development of its growth.'—*Bishop Shuttleworth on 1 Cor. xv.* quoted by *Dr Peile*.

from those that are thought to destroy it, not in kind, but in number and degree. It has no fixed nature when applied to bodies; and questions about the identity of a body are very often questions about words. But identity when applied to persons has no ambiguity, and admits not of degrees, or of more and less: it is the foundation of all rights and obligations, and of all accountability; and the notion of it is fixed and precise.

‘My personal identity implies the continued existence of that indivisible thing which I call myself, and I am conscious of being the same by an exercise of memory.’

Dr Brown¹ determines, I think most clearly,

¹ The belief of personal, or as he prefers calling it, mental identity, arises not from any inference of reasoning, but from a principle of intuitive assent, operating universally, immediately, irresistibly, and therefore justly to be regarded as essential to our constitution,—a principle exactly of the same kind, as those to which reasoning itself must ultimately be traced, and from which alone its consecutive series of propositions can derive any authority. This belief, though intuitive, is not involved in any one of our separate feelings, which considered merely as present, might succeed each other in endless variety without affording any notion of a sentient being, more permanent than the sensation itself, but that it arises, on the consideration of our feelings as successive, in the same manner as our belief of proportion or relation in general arises, not from the conception of *one* of the related objects or ideas, but only after the previous conception of both the relative and the correlative; or rather that the belief of identity does not arise as subsequent, but is involved in the very remembrance which allows us to consider our feelings as successive, since it is impossible for us to regard them as successive, without regarding them as feelings of our sentient self: not flowing, therefore, from experience or reasoning but essential to them, and necessarily implied in them, since there can be no result in experience,

that the result of all this is, that mental¹ identity would be a more correct expression than personal identity, and that memory is the evidence we have of identity. Consciousness is evidence of present identity, and the memory of past consciousnesses the evidence of our being now the same beings that we were at a previous time.

Let us now add to this the presumption that we have of the perfection of our faculties in the risen state, and we should get a perfect memory which would make us entirely certain of the identity of ourselves with our past man; and though we concluded in the last Lecture that a similarity of outward form seemed to be presumable from the risen body of our Saviour, yet now we are able to dispense with this; for recognition in the perfected state of the faculties may be quite independent of any bodily quality². We may be able to have cognizance of the consciousness of others in some way of which now we are ignorant,

but in the mind which remembers that it has previously observed, and no reasoning but to the mind which remembers that it has felt the truth of some proposition from which the truth of its present conclusion is derived.—*Dr Brown's Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, Lect. xv. pp. 336, 7.

¹ See a curious Tract called '*man in quest of himself*' in the '*metaphysical Tracts by English Philosophers of the 18th century*,' edited by *Dr S. Parr*.—The author was *Abraham Tucker*.

² Thus S. Augustine explains the saying, *We shall see Him as He is*, '*De visione Dei secundum interiorem hominem certissimi simus. Si autem etiam corpus mira commutatione hoc valuerit, aliud accedet, non illud abscedet.*'—*Commonitorium ad Fortunatianum*, seu *Ep. cXLVIII*.

and thus should not require any material resemblance to facilitate recognition. S. Paul says, we know that ‘we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;’ and again, ‘then shall we know even as we are known.’ May we not conclude from these sayings that the perceptive and reflective faculties shall be enhanced in some wonderful manner, and thus the risen man be capable of knowing others and knowing himself, without those aids which we now require to enable us to do so? so that mental identity may be sufficient in all respects to constitute our ideas of *sameness*¹.

Thus man is composed of a living body and a rational soul, according to ordinary phraseology; or of body, soul, and spirit, according to that of S. Paul; the body and soul in the latter case corresponding to the living body with parts and passions in the former, the rational soul of ordinary language to the spirit of the apostolical epistles. That which M. Antoninus² calls *σῶμα*,

¹ *Mr Mill (on the Human Mind, Vol. II. p. 132), ‘The life of man is a series of antecedents and consequents, known by experience, i.e. sensation, memory, and other cases of association. Evidence of my own personal identity is the memory of a chain of states of consciousness.’*

² *Marci Antonini Meditationes, Lib. II. § 2, Lib. III. § 16, Lib. XII. § 3. Josephus, Antiq. I. 1. 2: ἔπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβὼν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἔνοικεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ψυχὴν.*

S. Paul also uses *σῶμα*, *ψυχὴ*, *νοῦς*, in Rom. vii. 25.

There is also another use of the word *ψυχὴ* to signify the will, in which case *σῶμα* is the body including the senses and sensitive appetites seated in the body, the flesh and the members, as opposed to the spirit and the mind. The *ψυχὴ* used as the *will*, is called *ψυχὴ πρακτικὴ*. To the *σῶμα* thus understood pertains *τὰ πάθη*,

ψυχή, νοῦς, is the σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα of S. Paul, or the σῶμα ψυχικόν and πνεῦμα of the 15th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. If during this life by the action of the Holy Spirit of God, the πνεῦμα of man be restored to its dominion in the human trilogy, so as to have ascendancy over the σῶμα and ψυχή, or σῶμα ψυχικόν, then the man will be raised to eternal glory. The πνεῦμα, which had returned to God when the natural body decayed, and the ψυχή or principle of animal life was suspended¹, must at the resurrection be reunited to a body, with a principle of life, in order that *man* may be raised again or restored: but this body shall be changed, and all the Epithumetic part of the ψυχή, which tended to corruption, shall be abolished. ‘This mortal must put on immortality, and this corruption must put on incorruption.’ The body is not to be *altogether* lost: nor the existence to be *altogether* spiritual².

ἐπιθυμία, and what *Philo* calls τὸ θῆλυ. *Socrates* calls it ἴππος, and the intellectual faculty is ἡνίοχος, its rider. In *S. Paul* the spirit is νοῦς, διάνοια, σύνεσις. Between them is this ψυχή, as *Irenæus*, ‘Anima est quidem inter hæc duo, aliquando subsequens spiritum elevatur ab eo, aliquando autem consentiens carni decedit in terrenas concupiscentias.’ See a learned and interesting note of *Dr Hammond* on *1 Thess.* v. 23, where the references are given for what is mentioned above.

¹ ψυχή, the principle of animal life. *Juvenal, Sat.* xv. 148:

‘Mundi

Principio indulsit communis conditor illis (sc. gregis mūtorum)
Tantum animas, nobis animum quoque,’ &c.

Seneca, Ep. LVIII.: ‘Animantia quemadmodum divido? ut dicam, quædam animum habent, quædam tantum animam.’

² ‘De spiritali corpore, quod in resurrectione habebimus, quan-

The spirit is to be reunited to a living body, to be clothed upon with 'our house from heaven,' all that tended to mortality in it being 'swallowed up of life.'

In the new state the man will be conscious that he is the same person who lived, and acted his part on earth, who believed, and who died; having perfect memory of all past consciousnesses, perfect apprehension of his past relation to other beings and of their present relation to him, and thus he will know that he is the same Individual being, when he anew walks the earth, and in the certainty of this identity, personality, individuality, he will commence, in complete manhood, the Life Everlasting.

And as far as identity is concerned, the same must be true of the bodies of the wicked as well as of the righteous; we may reasonably conjecture (in the silence of Holy Scripture) that in all glorious qualities attaching to the risen body of the just, there must be a marked distinction, while we conceive them to have perfect consciousness of identity, both of themselves and others, and

tum capiat in melius commutationem, utrum in simplicitatem spiritus cedat, ut totus nemo jam spiritus sit; an quod magis puto, sed nondum plena fiducia confirmo, ita futurum sit spiritale corpus, ut propter ineffabilem quamdam facilitatem spiritale dicatur, servet tamen substantiam corporalem, quæ per seipsam vivere ac sentire non possit, sed per illum qui ea utitur spiritum, &c....multa alia quæ in hac questione movere (forte moveri) possunt, fateor me nondum alicubi legisse quod mihi sufficere existimarem sive ad discendum sive ad docendum.'—*S. Augustin. Commonitorium ad Fortunatianum*, § 16.

also that they will be incorruptible, that is, fitted for the Future Life of Condemnation¹.

In all this it has been my endeavour, following the light of reason, in submission to Holy Scripture, to shew wherein identity of persons in the resurrection consists; to make it plain that such identity involves no contradictions, such as are alleged against the supposition of numerical sameness of particles; to indicate the method by which it is shewn to be reasonable that the risen man should be called the same *person*, even though there be no single particle of matter in the risen body which pertained to the mortal body, viz. this,—by reducing the idea of identity to sameness of the spirit or intellectual part of man; and so without any call upon faith for singular physical and carnal conceptions of identity of substance, to make good the declaration of Holy Scripture, that all mankind will be raised again incorruptible, to undergo a judgment, which each individual man will be convinced is *several*, as far as

¹ *S. Augustini Sermo CCCLXII. De Resurrectione*: ‘Qui antea in Spiritu per fidem non resurrexerint, non ad illam commutationem resurgent in corpore ubi assumetur et absorbebitur omnis corruptio, sed ad illam pœnalem integritatem. Nam integra erunt et corpora impiorum, nihil ex iis imminutum apparebit, sed ad pœnam erit integritas corporis et quædam, ut ita dicam, quædam firmitas corporis, corruptibilis firmitas, &c.’ *S. Chrysostom, Homily x. on 2 Ep. ad Cor.*: ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις κοινὴ πάντων, ἡ δὲ δόξα οὐκέτι κοινὴ, ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν ἐν τιμῇ, οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰς βασιλείαν, οἱ δὲ εἰς κόλασιν ἀναστήσονται. *Homil. de Resurrectione Mortuorum*: καὶ γὰρ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ἄφθαρτα ἀνίστανται καὶ ἀθάνατα· ἀλλ’ ἡ τιμὴ αὕτη ἐφόδιον αὐτοῖς κολάσεως γίνεται καὶ τιμωρίας. ἄφθαρτα γὰρ ἀνίσταται, ἵνα διαπαντὸς καίηται.

he is concerned; that the words, 'Every man shall bear his own burden,' are verified with scrupulous exactness; and that we shall receive the things done in the body with perfect consciousness of the justice and equity of the sentence.

Without attempting to investigate or conjecture further about the pneumatic body, we may yet perhaps be allowed to suggest that certain adaptations of the body to the governing principle of spirit (τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν of Antoninus) may be retained; for as we have been accustomed to receive perceptions of external things by the senses, and to manifest volition by the bodily organs, it is reasonable to connect these organs in the memory with those perceptions and volitions; and the peculiar intellectual mode which is the joint result of this conduct of the understanding, and exercise of the bodily powers, both outwardly and inwardly, may actually constitute the identity which we are seeking to define; and if so, we shall see herein an additional reason for the restoration of the body to constitute the same man, because it is, as Tertullian¹ writes, 'the cogitatorium of the soul.' *Caro omne animæ cogitatorium.*

In the Old Testament we have the return of the Spirit to Him who gave it, as the guarantee of the preservation of identity. In the New we get the further notion, that in this life men's bodies are made the Temples of the Holy Ghost²,

¹ *De Resurrectione Carnis*, § 15.

² This expression is sometimes objected to, but I am unable to

and therefore shall hereafter be redeemed from their inheritance of corruption, and when changed from the natural to the spiritual, shall be re-united to the same spirit; and thus the revelation of the Gospel in this matter is a revelation of the salvation of the *whole man*, of his being transferred from the human tribe where the mundane principle is predominant, to the new human tribe where the spirit is predominant.

The quickening of men's mortal bodies by the Spirit is the expression of this change, and the mode in which the Scriptures speak of it allows us to speak of it also as the actual raising of man's body in a new state, and justifies us in so doing.

While therefore we consider it as undoubted that the glorified body is very different in its qualities and in its substance from those which we now have, yet as the risen body is *ours*, as well as the body in which we now dwell, in respect of this property of being *ours*, it is the same. If man will be conscious that he is the same being, his resurrection-body will be *His* body, and the memory of past consciousnesses of connexion with the body, will, to all intents and purposes, make it to him the very same.

This remark I make because it seems to me that in addressing the majority of mankind, who discover why. There is no doubt that the collective body of Christians is called the Temple of the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. iii. 16, and 2 Cor. vi. 16, Ephes. ii. 21, 22; and as little doubt is there that each Christian's body is called the Temple of the Holy Ghost in 1 Cor. vi. 19. See *Macknight's* note on the latter passage.

will not attend to the metaphysical distinctions which obviate difficulties, we must adhere to the way in which the revealed Word of God treats these matters. It is of immense importance that we lose not the idea of final retribution to ourselves *individually*; and if our Lord, in urging men to the sacrifice of those inclinations which are most dear to us, in order to avoid wrath to come, uses illustrations taken from the notion of our *present* bodies continuing in the new state of existence, we ought not to shrink from using the same forcible and earnest monitions. We may defend the doctrine of the resurrection of the body from cavils by shewing that we do not require any faith in things contradictory: we may admit, as I have done, a purely mental Identity as satisfying metaphysical ideas of sameness in individual persons; but this is not to draw us into an abandonment of the scriptural mode of speaking, which is no doubt intended, in the wisest manner possible, to influence the majority of mankind, and is adapted to its end by the wisdom of the Divine Spirit. We must not, in compliment to the scrupulous and captious reasoner, preach the Gospel in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in words which God the Holy Ghost teacheth. How shall the divine message be made most effectual to reclaim men from sin? This it is our bounden duty to inquire; and though with some men it may be necessary to make such distinctions and admissions as shall secure their assent, and for this

purpose it may be shewn that the Scriptures do not contradict any well-founded metaphysical conclusions, yet there are others whose minds, not being keenly sensitive to these scruples, would fail to be touched if they are addressed in the guarded language of the schools. ‘Who knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?’ The wise must be taken in their own craftiness, but others in their simplicity. As therefore the Spirit of God searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God, no one can know these things but that Divine Spirit, and in His words are we to teach and exhort men to flee from perdition.

Now our Saviour tells us that it is better to enter into life maimed, or halt, or deprived of our bodily organs, than to preserve our members which are the instruments of sin to us, and to be cast into hell, ‘the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.’ I do not then hesitate to address the same warnings now to myself and others. I fear lest by the idea of change in the body, I should weaken the appeal which is made to me as to the reality of the life to come, lest I should be apt to consider these things as belonging to a state far from me, and from my present impressions and feelings; and I try to arouse myself by such appeals as the following:

“Remember, O man, that the Resurrection to which we are to be called at the day of God’s

just judgment is a Resurrection of the Body. That this sentient frame in which thou now dwellest, thine own body, is to be restored again with enlarged capabilities and an infinite capacity for happiness or woe.

“The record of thy past actions shall be unerring; the Judge incorruptible and omniscient; the sentence one that cannot be avoided. And all this thou must meet as a man: thine own body shall be there united to thine own soul. And these members, which every one loveth and cherisheth, shall be there, and shall at the bidding of the Almighty be ready to turn informers against thee, and bear testimony to past sins unrepented of. From thine own body shall come the sentence of death. There shall be the hand that hath been put forth to take unlawful gains, that hath been lifted against thy brother, or been raised in reckless impiety to mock the Most High. There shall be the foot that hath walked in the way of sinners, that hath been swift to shed innocent blood, that hath spurned the widow and the fatherless. There shall be the eye that hath glared in malice or pierced in envy; the eye that hath been a willing inlet of lust upon the passions. And the tongue,—that world of iniquity,—the tongue that hath lied, the tongue that hath spoken blasphemy, the tongue that hath sworn falsely, the tongue that hath taught heresy. All these of thine own household shall become thy foes. The partners and instruments of thy guilt

shall be the witnesses, when God shall reveal the secrets of men in the day of Jesus Christ. It is no shadowy, unreal, realm of spirits, no mere flitting dreams of a disturbed conscience, that thou shalt then await. But thou shalt see the Judge as he is; in substantial verity shalt thou, the same man, hear the words, 'He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption : ' a sentence, awful, but just: we may not gainsay it.

“ On the contrary, if penitent and humble, and if thou hast died in faith, and thy sins have been blotted out, the crimson stain having been cleansed away in the fountain open for sin and all uncleanness, thou shalt recall, when thy merciful Judge addresses thee as blessed, thy hands uplifted in prayer, and thy feet which have carried thee to the house of God, and the dwelling of the mourner, the eyes that have wept for past sins, and shed tears of compassion over the sick and the fatherless, the tongue that hath sung God's praises, and the lips that have declared His judgments. Thou shalt remember that the cry of the desolate was not rejected, that thou hast in obedience to Christ and in love for Him opened thine hand freely to help and befriend Him, in succouring the poor and needy in their distress. The bodily exercises which profit nothing, if done with vain hopes of their being in themselves pleasing to God, may yet be remembered, if undertaken to subdue, by the aid of God's holy Spirit, the remnants of corruption. Thou shalt rejoice in all those things which

thou wast counted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake, and in the anticipation of experiencing the fulness of His love shalt realize the blessedness which S. Paul could tell thee of, when he looked at the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory which awaited him after his sufferings for Christ in life present, 'bearing about in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus.'"

There is nothing inconsistent in thus addressing men, while we hold the true doctrine of personal identity, because they must be instructed as they are able to bear it. There is a certain moral result to be obtained, the empire of Christ is to be promoted in the hearts of men, and the promises and revelations of the Gospel are the means thereunto, to be used as the weapons of the Spirit of God in spiritual warfare against evil. These must be *so* used as to produce the required effect. And in urging men with the solemn warnings which the Resurrection of the Body is capable of producing, we are no more inconsistent in telling them that in this very same Body they shall live again, than we are in assuring them that they are the same men who years ago were dedicated to God in baptism by a visible outward sign. The seams of vice in the haggard and guilty countenance of a hardened offender will last for years after the substance of the body has changed; the brand of the galley-slave endures to his dying hour; it is the same body, in the popular and practical sense of the words. So in speaking of

the Day of Resurrection, (while he admits to the subtle objector that the word *same* must be used in a peculiar sense, yet) for all practical and useful purposes the Christian must adhere to the words of Scripture, and, while he professes his belief in the Resurrection of the Dead, must have a definite, clear, and unshaken faith in this great mystery,—that at the day when God shall be pleased to judge the sons of men by Jesus Christ, he shall come forth, conscious to himself that he is the *same* man, and then must await the awful decision on which his eternal fate depends.

The sum then of the remarks offered in this and the preceding Lectures will be as follows :

There have been left in man in his fallen state yearnings for immortality, a conviction of a future life of some kind, and of retribution for conduct on earth. To the favoured people of God intimations were given of something more definite, of inheritance of divine blessings, which, as divine, could not be finite; and of the bringing back to life those who had departed; but this still only dimly led to the idea of a resurrection. The uncertainty, however, is made clear by the revelation of Jesus Christ. We are herein taught the fact of a new creation, the regeneration of human nature; that the sentence of mortality is abrogated, and that all mankind shall rise again and live in the body; that those whom God owns for His sons thereby *inherit* incorruption—sonship of God involving that idea, from the beginning of the cre-

ation to the end of the world¹. That when restored to life again, all the mortal, carnal element in the Sons of God will have disappeared, and their resurrection-body will be spiritual instead of carnal, an help meet for the glorified, sanctified, purified spirit, and entirely in subjection to it instead of the animal soul. That, though in material particles it may have nothing in common with the former body, yet undoubtedly by the restoration of the faculties to a *perfect* state, the risen man will be completely conscious of his identity with his former self, as clearly and as distinctly as he now is of being the same person during his existence on earth, and thus will attain to that which he looked for in his mortal existence,—the redemption of the Body.

This glorious inheritance is within the reach of all of us, who are in Christ's new covenant; we should strive now earnestly to become fit for it. And if through FAITH we lay hold on the HOPE set before us, and shew this by our LOVE to God and the brethren, the holy Spirit of God will in due time exalt us to the place whither our Saviour Christ is gone before; and redeemed, we shall in the bright, happy, and glorious train follow our triumphant Master into the Heaven of heavens, the Holy City of our God.

Unto which may it please Him of his infinite mercy to bring us all through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¹ See *Archbishop Tillotson, Sermon LXVI.* Vol. I. fol. ed.

LECTURE IV.

S. JOHN II. 18—22.

Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

THE argument for the verity of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ has been so thoroughly handled that it can hardly need reproducing at the present day. We are not surprised, nevertheless, that in the current infidel literature all the old objections are revived. This is the usual plan on which the opponents of Christianity proceed, and the best answer to them is to bring out of the treasury the armour which has been stored up, and reproduce it for the conflict. Bishop Sherlock's 'Trial of the Witnesses,' and subsequent works of that date, which take up the question and answer the cavils of dissatisfied antagonists, are still, as far as I can judge, the best

defence of the orthodox doctrine; and to these we ought to refer when need arises.

But though the main facts on which our religion depends, are as clearly proved, as in the Dispensation of FAITH we have any right to expect, there may often remain in some of the particulars which surround them, points which require consideration, because they involve difficulties, which therefore are laid hold of by the enemies of Christianity, and may be distorted so as to cause uneasiness in the minds of some, and disturb their convictions, though they may not prevail to overcome them.

I propose in the present Lecture to consider, as a subject suitable to the season to which these Lectures have been assigned, the question of the prophecies of our Lord's resurrection; and in so doing to follow the author of the 'Life of Jesus' on this point, and endeavour to set aside the prejudice he creates in the minds of his readers against the truth of Christ's resurrection, by attempts to disprove the fact, that our Lord himself uttered predictions of that event.

It is very difficult, in one sense, to grapple with selected portions of this writer's arguments; because there is hardly any common ground on which to rest: his theory being based mainly on this idea—that the synoptical writers, or the first three Evangelists, as well as S. John writing long after the first preaching of Christianity, made their narratives according to the prevalent impres-

sions of their day ; the first giving us the ordinary current notions of the Christian Church, and so retailing in their histories legendary tales along with some historical fragments ; and the latter putting into the mouth of our Lord sayings which accorded with the form which the doctrine had taken in his time, or supporting his private views by attributing to Christ's own words meanings which the writer himself had conceived, or the teachers of his day and his party had adopted.

The guidance of the Holy Spirit is completely ignored ; nothing is taken as true because it is written ; our books which we regard as inspired are treated as if they were mere pamphlets tinged with party spirit ; or as we should now treat some ephemeral modern account of any remarkable events of fifty years back.

No doubt the way to repel such views, and successfully resist such a system, is to do battle to its first principles, to vindicate to the Evangelists their true character, to re-establish the credibility of their histories, on the solid grounds of their genuineness and authenticity, and to maintain the certainty of their testimony on the truth of their inspiration, and their special guidance by the Holy Spirit of God in recording those facts, doctrines, and precepts, a knowledge of which is essential to the well-being of the Church of Christ.

But how few of those into whose hands are put the works which reflect on the Faith of the Church ever have the antidote ! How many there

are who take up casually a book like the 'Life of Jesus,' and see the specious objections which are heaped together in every page, and made to tell in the mass of their discordance against our whole theological system; and how many of these carry away with them the bare fact, that *a* difficulty has been pointed out, for which they have no ready solution! And who shall say whether this may not be a plague-spot of the conscience, the germ of a spirit of disaffection to the Church, the commencement of a falling away from the faith?

It is not then a labour of small importance to endeavour to obviate the force of objections urged against particular parts of the history detailed in the Gospels. It is allowed, that the real contest with the school of mythical interpreters must be carried on against the fundamental ideas of their system, but it is also presumed, that the way in which they bring to bear in their favour difficulties of interpretation, or disagreements of annotators on the Scriptures, may be shewn to be unfair, and sophistical, with advantage to those (a large class) who are prone to take up particular cases, and who are troubled in their minds by such distorted and exaggerated representation of erroneous conceptions, by ingenious juxtapositions of accounts apparently contradictory, which the subtle foes of dogmatic Christianity pretend to point out in our sacred books.

In the case which we propose to consider, the main strength of the objection to the ordinary

idea which seems to be patent on the face of the history, that Christ repeatedly foretold his own Resurrection, is this: that the Apostles after our Lord's apprehension, trial, and death, seem to have had no expectation whatever of such an event. 'Nothing,' says Strauss, 'shews the least trace of their remembrance of predictions which had announced to them that their Master's death should be followed by a resurrection; nor the least spark of hope of seeing such predictions accomplished.'

The expectation of the women who intended to embalm the body, their amazement at finding the tomb empty, the reception which the apostles gave to the report of the women, which they treated as idle tales, their disbelief in the account of the women who had seen Christ, and the final doubts of some when many had become convinced; all these facts are heaped together to shew that it is not at all probable that our Lord foretold his resurrection, and therefore, argues this writer, when the myth of the Resurrection had become so prevalent as to command general belief, the predictions were invented by the Gospel-writers, and inserted in the narrative, to support the prevalent persuasion.

The direct predictions of the Resurrection being thus disposed of, he next attacks the indirect or typical prophetic assertions, especially that of our text, to shew that it could not have the meaning which S. John attaches to it. Before

discussing this, we may consider the first objections to the record of Christ having foretold his resurrection.

Its main strength, as we have before said, lies in the acknowledged fact, of the want of faith in the Apostles and others, after our Lord's death : if then we can shew that there was nothing surprising in this, but rather the contrary, we shall remove the chief part of the difficulty. It will not be necessary to argue against the supposition of the spuriousness of the predictions attributed to Christ, because, consenting to do this would be surrendering important positions, which we have said must be maintained, as to the credibility of the whole Gospel History. I mean that the question of the genuineness or spuriousness of the recorded prophecies is not to be decided on narrow grounds, but must be made to rest on the settlement of much larger questions, the Inspiration and Authenticity of the Gospels ; and the integrity of the narrative must be preserved from such partial criticisms. While then we keep this in mind, we may with advantage argue from the internal evidence of the history itself, that these unfavourable conclusions are not warranted, and that there is no such inconsistency in the conduct of the Apostles as should make us require an extraordinary adjustment of the facts of the case. For this object we may notice :—

First : that the Apostles being unlearned men, were not probably acquainted with the doctrine

of the Resurrection, about which the principal religious schools in Judæa debated and argued : and so the Resurrection of the Dead was a strange idea to them. We are not left in doubt in this matter, for on one occasion, when our Lord spake of His Resurrection, they understood not the saying, as S. Mark tells us, (ix. 32), and also that the saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken (S. Luke xviii. 34), and that they questioned with one another what the Resurrection of the Dead should mean, (S. Mark ix. 10). They were, indeed, hereafter to see instances of persons raised from the dead by our Lord¹; but in these cases they had before their eyes the prophet in whom they trusted exercising miraculous power ; and when he was himself apprehended, condemned, and put to death, and their faith in Him was shaken, who was then to call him back to life? With His death came the destruction of all their hopes, and

¹ Such instances were however of a very different kind to what we conceive involved in the idea of 'the Resurrection of the Dead,' speaking generally ; as those persons raised from the dead were, as far as we can learn, not exempted from ultimate mortality. It makes their resurrection not differ very much from the healing of disease. Some persons have made needless enquiries about the fact, whether persons raised from the dead by our Lord were again to die. S. *Augustine* may answer the enquiry thus, *Enarratio in Ps. cxxvi. v. 7*: 'Unus resurrexit jam non moriturus. Resurrexit Lazarus, sed moriturus ; resurrexit Filia archisynagogi, sed moritura ; resurrexit filia viduæ, sed moriturus ; resurrexit Christus, non moriturus.' *In Ps. cxxii. 4*: 'Multi enim ante illum mortui sunt, sed nemo ante illum resurrexit in æternum.' *In Ps. cxxix. 9*: 'Nemo resurrexerat nunquam moriturus, nisi Dominus.'

there was none to whom they could then look for support, encouragement, or assistance. A resurrection from the dead of any one, without a divine messenger to exert power over him, was a strange idea to them. We have indeed reason to suppose that among the more educated of the Jewish people the doctrine of a resurrection was generally received, and though rejected by some, yet understood by them; but still it does not seem improbable that the words quoted from S. Mark's Gospel are to be taken in their plain literal meaning, and that the poor fishermen from the coasts of the sea of Galilee did not yet understand what was meant by the Resurrection of the Dead¹.

But suppose it could be shewn that the idea of a resurrection of the dead were more universally prevalent than such a supposition would assume; we may, in the second place, argue that the Apostles may only have looked for *some* re-

¹ There was a gradual progress in the clearness of the prophecies of the resurrection, as the disciples were able to bear it, and gained, or might have gained, in knowledge of Christ's kingdom. Thus we have the emblematic prophecy in S. John, 2d chapter, at the beginning of our Lord's ministry, on his first journey to Jerusalem. After he returned into Galilee, we have the sign of Jonas, S. Matt. xii. 38, S. Luke xi. 29; repeated again at another time, see S. Matt. xvi. 4. Subsequently to those he began to instruct the disciples more clearly, S. Matt. xvi. 21, S. Mark viii. 31, S. Luke ix. 21. Again, S. Matt. xvii. 9, S. Mark ix. 10; then S. Mark, ix. 30, and parallel passages; and on his journey to Jerusalem for the last time, S. Matt. xx. 17, S. Mark x. 32, S. Luke xviii. 31; and in his last discourses, S. John xiv. 18—28; xvi. 16—20, and just before his passion, S. Matt. xxvi. 32.

storation of the doctrine, and following of Christ, at *some* future time, and not have understood that 'the third day' was to be taken literally. Now with candour which commands respect and confidence in their veracity, the Evangelist tells us of the slowness of comprehension of the immediate hearers of Christ, and how after his resurrection things which he had told them received as it were new light, and were understood by them in their real intent, whereas *before* they could not comprehend them. So we are told in the text, 'When he was risen from the dead the disciples remembered that he had said this unto them.' And the angel, who told those who came early to the sepulchre about the prophecy of the resurrection, speaks thus: 'He is not here, but is risen: *remember* how he spake unto you, when he was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day he must rise again. And *they remembered his words.*' All this makes us inclined to believe that the disciples could not have understood our Lord in any literal sense, even when he spake openly, (*παρησιᾶ*, S. Mark viii. 32); for S. Peter's attempt to rebuke our Lord for applying to himself the words foretelling his passion, shews us what temper they were of, and what aversion they had to entertain thoughts of his actual passion. Therefore it will not be a groundless conjecture if we suppose that on other occasions of His forewarning them, and com-

forting them with assurances of his return to life and re-appearance among them, they might conclude that he only intended the restoration, in some way or other, of the kingdom of heaven, after a temporary obscurity.

This applies to the time between his death and resurrection still more strongly; for in the third place their minds were pre-occupied with an erroneous idea of a temporal kingdom, which would disincline them even to entertain for a short time the notion of the *Messiah* being really and actually one who had suffered death; and when their hopes were utterly gone, and they considered that they had been indulging in a dream which was not to be satisfied, 'we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel' (understanding literally the prophecy of Zacharias), we ought not to be surprised that they should have ceased to remember His promise of a Resurrection. When He had, as they thought, so bitterly disappointed them, his mention of a temporary absence, even if they recollected it, must have seemed to them almost a mockery, when contrasted with their frustrated expectations. Their views generally before the outpouring of the Spirit were carnal; up to the very time of the Ascension, the same impression prevailed that they were to be set up over Israel, (Acts i. 16). How unlikely then that just after the shock of our Lord's death, as a leader of sedition among the people, and the premature and abrupt close

of His career, (as they then fancied,)—having forsaken him, and fled from him, and hiding in secret places for fear of the Jews—how unlikely that they should remember his prophecy of coming to life again so as to anticipate any positive actual fulfilment of it.

Fourthly: Strauss thinks it incredible that the disciples should disbelieve, and the chief priests and Pharisees be sufficiently alive to the report to act upon it¹. But let us consider the difference in position of the two parties. The disciples dismayed and confounded at the sudden discomfiture of all their anticipations, their worst fears verified, themselves suspected of being privy to seditious intentions, and their Leader and Master taken prisoner and destroyed. On the other hand, the priests and Pharisees considering that they had crushed a dangerous rebellion against their religion and polity, and anxious to take every means to secure their advantage; many of them (as we cannot but suppose) acting on imperfect information and exaggerated accounts, honestly thinking that the new sect was like others which they had witnessed, a plot or contrivance of cunning restless men to overthrow the government and change the laws; and conceiving that their security depended on the friendly disposition of the Roman power, they would be anxious to assist in re-

¹ The doubts that have been thrown on the genuineness of this narration are answered in *Michaelis Erklärung der Begräbniss und Auferstehungs geschichte Christi*, p. 84, et seq.

moving all appearance of disaffection to the ruling authority. Such men, when any rumour was brought of an intended prolongation of the seditious movement, knowing how easily the people were deceived, would not unnaturally take precautions. While the disciples, from the blasting of their hopes, and the prevalence of fear, would despondingly look for nothing but evil consequences to themselves; the others, exulting in their success, would strive carefully to prevent any, even the most improbable contrivances, from having any effect in reviving the dangerous faction which they had apparently destroyed.

From these considerations, arising out of the narrative as it comes to us, and assuming nothing more than the honesty of the writers, it seems to me that there is sufficient to account for the unbelief of the Apostles, and the fact that the promise of resurrection did not seem to give them any comfort in their distress.

And besides, we may further notice that it is a great exaggeration to say that they were inveterately disinclined to believe the news of the resurrection. S. Peter and S. John ran to the sepulchre as soon as they heard of it. The surprise and astonishment which they must have felt, and the rush of feelings of different kinds which must have filled their agitated hearts at this sudden little expected event, the strong revulsion from despondency to a wonderful expectation of still greater things to follow, beyond all

that they had so lately ventured to think : all this is indicated in the Evangelical accounts. 'They believed not for joy.' 'The women departed quickly from the sepulchre, with fear and great joy.' 'They trembled and were amazed, neither said they anything to any man, for they were afraid.' This fear and trembling, joy and amazement, with hopes of a new and strange kind in their bosoms, must have naturally made the Apostles, and those who came first to the sepulchre, move to and fro anxiously, and converse somewhat incoherently ; and if we estimate the effect of these various tumultuous feelings, we find rather a congruity and consistency in the variations of the accounts of their conduct¹.

Besides, if the Apostles had been too ready to receive the report of Christ's resurrection, it would have been used as an argument to shew that their expectations deceived them ; and that in their eagerness to receive intelligence of the actual fact of their Master having risen again, they were credulous, and on that account not trustworthy witnesses².

With every endeavour to appreciate the difficulty which persons have found in the conduct of the Apostles between the Lord's apprehension and resurrection, and the discrepancy which they fancy they discern between that conduct and

¹ 'Quod credunt tardius, non est perfidiæ sed anxoris.'—*S. Chrysostom. Serm. 81. (Dr Barrow.)*

² *Lampe in Blomf. Syn. Tom. III. p. 63.*

what is expected from them, I have not been able to see anything approaching to inconsistency: nothing in their hesitation and doubt but what might have been expected; and the narrative rather commends itself to me by its artless honest character in this respect, as the plain, true, genuine narrative of men who were real actors in the scenes which they describe.

To pass on to the text: the objection to the assertion of the Evangelist that this figurative saying referred to the body of Christ and to his resurrection from the dead, is urged thus: The scandal caused by the profanation of the temple by the buyers and sellers having provoked our Lord to an act of holy zeal, the Jews demanded a sign which should prove his mission from God, and so justify the authority which he assumed; His answer is, 'Destroy this temple, and I will raise it in three days.' The Jews understood this of the temple in which they were standing, but our Lord, it is said, meant the Temple of His Body. Did our Lord then intend to give them a sign really, or not? It is assumed that as he gave them this answer to their question, he intended that it should be an answer, and yet it was one which in its real sense, as we are assured by S. John, they could not generally understand. In reply to this question, we may observe that this is not the only occasion on which they came to Him with a request for a sign. Thus in the sixth chapter of S. John they said unto him, 'What

sign shewest thou that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work?' And they then urge the fact that Moses had clearly shewn his heaven-sent authority by giving them a sign. 'Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.' This demand of a sign on another occasion is treated by Christ as the offspring of curiosity, or an ill-disposed mind: 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas,' repeated twice in S. Matthew's Gospel. S. Mark tells us the Pharisees came forth and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. 'And he sighed deeply in spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? Verily I say unto you, that there shall be no sign given unto this generation;' or, as S. Luke reports it, 'There shall no sign be given, but the sign of the prophet Jonas.'

Now from this we may conclude that the sign was not meant to be intelligible to the generality of the audience; the natural character of the Gospel was opposed to this carnal demand for testing all things by actual sight, for this reason, that those who required it were not inclined to obey, not disposed towards eternal life; they were not in that state of mind in which they were accessible to the soft pleadings of the Spirit of God. S. Paul compares this tendency to require signs and wonders before faith, with the seeking

of the Greeks after wisdom, (1 Cor. i. 16,) and he proclaims the Gospel of Christ crucified as being exactly the opposite to these things, a stumbling-block instead of a sign to the Jews, and foolishness instead of wisdom to the Greeks.

Inasmuch as they would not come to Him that they might have life, our Lord preached to them in parables for a testimony, and taught them by signs not immediately to be apprehended, but such, that when the event signified had come to pass, they might prove to them that there had been a prophet among them. (Ezek. xxxiii. 33.)

The Evangelist tells us that he spake of the Temple of His Body. The Jews understood Him of the Temple in which they stood; and in answer to the question whether our Lord intended that they should thus understand him, we must reply, that He knew they would so apply His words, and therefore must have so intended. For in a figurative sense it was undoubtedly true that the destruction of the Temple should make way for the new spiritual Temple into which all God's children should be gathered; the passing away of the Jewish polity was to be succeeded by the fulness and universality of the Christian Church; and though he meant chiefly and primarily His own Body as the Temple, yet there was a sense in which the words as understood by the Jews would be a sign of the Divine appointment of Christ to regenerate the world; a sense which after generations might receive, and which we

can now fully understand, although at the time it was obscure and enigmatical. But we may also urge that it was possible for the Jews to have had perception of Christ's real meaning, for the word temple (*ναός*) as applied to the body, was not necessarily and altogether a strange idea to them. And there may have been some among his hearers not unfamiliar with the application of the word in this sense. The Hebrew word which signifies a dwelling (דָּוָר) is used for a man's body in the song of Hezekiah (Isai. xxxviii. 12.) The words translated *mine age is departed*, are understood by Vitringa as meaning 'my body was wasted away,' and he supports his opinion by that of Jewish interpreters of the Sacred Text. The words לָחַץ, and σκῆνος, a *tent*, to denote the body, are not of unfrequent occurrence. And besides, Philo uses the words *ναός* and *ἱερόν*, in speaking of the human body, to express the dignity of the indwelling soul¹; so that when S. Paul has these expressions, speaking of the same human body, and of the Church of Christ, and calls them temples of God through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, we may conclude that he was making use of phrase-

¹ *De Opificio Mundi*, pp. 93, 94, ed. Pfeiff. de corpore primi hominis οἶκος γὰρ τις ἢ νεὸς ἱερόν ἐτεκταίμετο ψυχῆς λογικῆς. See also *Origenes contra Celsum*, viii. pp. 389—391. ed. Spencer.

Philo imitated *Plato*, who said that the ἀγάλματα θεῶν were shut up in the bodies of men endowed with great talents and virtues, *Sympos.* c. 32; and the Greek fathers adopted this and imitated it in aftertimes. *Clemens Alex. Strom.* vii. c. 5; *Eusebius adv. Hieroclem*, c. 6.

ology not unknown to writers and readers of his day: and we know that in other subjects it has been conjectured, not without good reason, that he referred to the doctrines and used the language of the Alexandrian Jews.

That such intelligence of Christ's words on the part of those about him was very limited, we must indeed conclude; and the fact that the general idea attached to them was of an indefinite kind, may be gathered from the use made of the words afterwards. They would appear to have made a very deep impression upon the Jews: for we find them quoted by the false witnesses at Christ's trial, and used in insulting mockery by the scribes, when our Lord was hanging on the cross.

The false witnesses seem to have misrepresented what was said, for they do not use the words reported by S. John. They give their testimony in a way which would make us suppose that a figurative sense *was* partially understood. Their words are thus reported in S. Mark's Gospel: 'We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands.'

If in the transmission of the saying such an addition had been made as *ἀχειροποίητον*, it seems probable that it may have arisen from such partial understanding of a figurative sense in the words. The spiritual character of the second temple seems to be hinted at; and later still, in

the depositions against S. Stephen, we have it affirmed of him that he had said, 'Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and change the customs which Moses delivered us.' Does not this intimate that Christ's words had been construed to mean the abolition of the law, and the establishment of the kingdom of God in the Gospel? There is no doubt, however, that most persons considered them as conveying a boast on our Lord's part, which was a subject of ridicule rather than of solemn refutation. And it is either in this sense, or because it had an appearance of treating lightly what the Jews so much valued, that it was turned into a taunt by the passers by at the crucifixion: 'Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross.'

Now while any among the hearers understood *literally*, it is incredible, as some have supposed, that he should have indicated His own body by outward sign; for then neither the disciples nor the Pharisees could have been ignorant that he spake of the Temple of His Body; and we are told they really were so, till after he was risen from the dead.

We must then conclude that our Lord spoke in a manner that conveyed but a distant meaning; and that it was like others of his sayings: 'These things have I told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He.' And in this sense it agrees entirely

with what has been said of the way in which our Lord treated the demand for a sign on other occasions. It is quite clear, from the general tone of Christ's teaching, that the scribes and Pharisees were not of that disposition to which the Gospel is adapted in men. The demand for signs and wonders, if complied with, would not have had any effect. If they did not believe 'Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' In fact, we may at once assume that the signs if given would not have wrought conviction; for if they would have so done, we have a moral certainty that Christ would have given them. Can we believe that Herod, who hoped to have seen some miracle done by Christ, would have become His disciple, if our Lord had complied with this idle and impertinent curiosity? And since He knew all things, and needed not that any should testify of man, because He knew what was in man, and therefore full well could see the motives, and know the tendencies of His hearers, can we suppose it at all likely that the Divine power which He possessed would be uselessly paraded before them, leading to no result but the hardening of their hearts? Yet while the questioners were by their want of honest anxiety and genuine desire to know the truth, excluded from obtaining an answer, our Lord must have remembered that there were some wondering, trembling, anxious followers of His also standing by, who might have watched

for his answer with sincere desire to get conviction of the Truth; and for these He gave an answer to the question, a sign which as yet they should not understand, but one which, when the time should come, they should remember He had told them, and thus should be produced the conviction which they were ready to embrace and act upon.

Considered in this light there is nothing unreasonable or improbable in the account which S. John gives of the answer of our Lord to his objectors. It is entirely in agreement with the manner of his ordinary teaching of those who were not inquirers after truth; it forms a harmonious part of that system; and in considering it we have also assigned reasons for obviating similar objections to the sign of the prophet Jonas, which is very similar in some respects to that we have been discussing.

So that, on the whole, we have been unable to discern any reason for doubting about the fact that our blessed Lord before His passion repeatedly foretold his Resurrection, either from the conduct of the Apostles after His death, or from the obscurity or apparent indirectness of the figures under which it was signified; and we are therefore not at all prepared to surrender any ground of faith in the Divine Mission of Christ by allowing of inconsistency in the evangelical accounts between the fact of predictions and the slowness

and despondency of Christ's followers in believing the Resurrection.

Indeed, to argue the question on such low grounds is rather an effort for a Christian. He feels that his faith in the divinely-inspired Scriptures as the Oracles of God, a faith first of all determined by external evidence, prevents him from undertaking with patience the examination of the credibility of particular facts recorded therein. We are doing violence to our respect for the sacred writers when we canvass their writings with such pitiful suspicion. And though we are obliged to meet cavils wherever they are started, it is one of the most painful duties of an advocate for Revelation that he has occasionally to suspend or lay aside the conviction he has of the Bible being the true and living Word of the Divine Ruler of the universe, in order to meet objections, and canvass difficulties, with those who are otherwise minded.

Thus in the case we have been considering, when he knows that the Resurrection of Christ is the corner-stone of the Gospel, and that the hesitations and doubts which men have invented for themselves, and pretended to find in the sacred narrative, have really for their end to throw discredit on that great and fundamental doctrine, he can hardly with patience stay to unravel the small meshes of the net which is being thrown over the faith of Christendom. He longs to get free from

such miserable cavils, and urge the arguments which are weapons of attack rather than of defence.

See the wisdom with which Christ's chosen followers were taken from a class whose limited knowledge and constant prejudices were in all respects obstacles rather than favourable to ambitious schemes. See their weaknesses recorded, and their slowness of apprehension; how they constantly misunderstood their Master, how they abandoned Him in His hour of peril, how they clung as long as they could to unworthy carnal views of power, opposed entirely to what he wished to impress on them, how they hesitated, and wondered, and doubted, when glimpses of the truth of His Resurrection were made known to them, how completely they were of themselves incapable of inventing and carrying out any imposture; and then see if the whole work be not evidently of God. See if there be any way of accounting for the first spread of Christianity, unless these men were endowed with special power from the Creator of men, and Ruler of the universe.

Their simple story was, that Christ Jesus, whom the Jews had slain, was risen from the dead, and had invested them with powers of the most extraordinary kind, to effect the conversion of all nations to his religion. And they succeeded, in the midst of hostile races, hostile governments, and hostile neighbours. Jews, heathen, Roman powers, priests, social institutions, systems of policy, of

philosophy, of religion, were all against them, were all rudely shocked by their attacks and their new doctrines; nothing was in their favour but truth, Divine truth, backed by Heaven-sent testimony. And in spite of all opposition, in spite of threats and punishment, in spite of persecutions and dispersion, in spite of Jewish hatred, and Roman violence, and Grecian contempt, they *succeeded*. They succeeded in convincing thousands that the story they had to tell, the message they had to deliver, were TRUE. And all was based upon the Resurrection of Christ. They themselves told their hearers, 'If Christ be not risen, our faith is vain.' ALL depended upon this. Were they not then themselves convinced of its truth? Were not their accounts of it to be credited?

And if the narrative in its honesty reveal to us what we now call, *after the event*, their marvellous unbelief in the predictions of our Lord, this very fact becomes a testimony to their sincerity and singleness of purpose. It shews us that they are honest and true men, to record their own deficiencies. It is a proof of their trustworthiness. Would not a different record have provoked the opposite objections? If they had believed all our Lord foretold them, and been anxious to find the Resurrection a fact, would not this have called forth from enemies expressions of doubt with respect to a circumstance which those who reported it were so much interested in finding to be true?

But, as it is, the Divinely-inspired histories seem to give us evidence of their origin from their exact accordance with the wants we should feel, in examining into the foundations of our faith ; and the very circumstance,—that in spite of predictions of His Resurrection, the Apostles were slow to expect it,—and yet that they recorded this,—and then spent their lives, their energies, their blood, in testifying to mankind—how true He was whom they had doubted, and in whose words they had not sufficiently confided,—how entirely they trusted in Him whom they had abandoned to His enemies in the hour of peril,—how certain they were in His present existence at the right-hand of God, being raised again from the dead to dispense life and immortality to man :—All this, I say, comes home to our judgments and to our affections, and by the aid of the Holy Spirit of God, now convinces us that the Christian religion is the only true one ; that in trusting to its monitions and promises we are trusting to the very voice of God, and that our true wisdom and true happiness will be in believing the Scripture, and the Word which Jesus hath said.

NOTE TO LECTURE I.

Wolffi Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ, Vol. i. p. 315.

“Some think that this is an argument *ad hominem*, and not sufficient of itself to prove what is proposed. So *Richard Simon*, in *Respons. ad Judicia Theologorum Bataavorum de Historia sua Critica*, c. xx. p. 245, and *J. Basnage*, in *Hist. Jud.* Tom. iii. p. 387; and for the opposite opinion, see *Olearius on this place*, and *Lacroze, Entretien sur divers sujets*, p. 185, and *Scherzer in Programm.* p. 176. The opinion that our Lord’s argument is to shew the immortality of the soul, and not the resurrection of the body, is maintained in the *Confession of the Oriental Church*, edited by *Laurentius Normannus*, p. 61. Now certainly the whole object of the Sadducees who disputed with Christ is opposed to this. That they wished here particularly to oppose the idea of the resurrection of the body may be concluded from their bringing their argument from matrimonial connexion, which cannot be attributed to the soul, or any existence deprived of bodily passion, but only of the body. When then our Saviour answers them, we must suppose that he followed out their original idea. Interpreters differ in pointing out the force of the argument; we will bring that forward which we think the best. The Saviour here refers to the covenant made between God and the patriarchs, see Gen. xvii. 7. ‘But they with whom God makes a covenant of grace, that he will be their God for ever, they must be recalled to life that they may enjoy the promised federal grace. This covenant is eternal, and therefore they who are included in it must live for ever, and therefore be raised up.’ So *Gerhardus in Harmonia Evangelic.* c. 155, p. 471, which *Olearius* in the place cited above has enlarged and improved, by stating thus the conclusion of the whole argument, that the patriarchs by virtue of the covenant which God made with them, through faith in the promised seed, have already acquired the *principle* of life, in virtue of which the death in which they are now held does not involve their destruction, but the completion of that life which necessarily must be exhibited according to the covenant at the proper time. . . . We may remark, that the Jews refer to this covenant when they wish to prove the resurrection of the dead. In *Gemara.* ch. הלל, the tradition of *Rabbi Simai* is produced: ‘In what place does the Law teach the Resurrection of the Dead? Where it is said, And I will establish my covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan.’ (Ex. vi. 4). For it does not say *with you*, but *with them*. It is also said in the same place, that *Gamaliel* produced against the Sadducees, when they were demanding proof of the resurrection from the Law, this place, ‘Which land the Lord sware unto your fathers that he would give them,’ Deut. xi. 21.”

See also the arguments of *Eulogius*, quoted by *Photius, Bibliotheca*, ch. cxxxi. p. 886.

LECTURE V.

S. MATTHEW XII. 31, 32.

All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men : but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him : but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

WE cannot be surprised that in all ages of the Church, the meaning of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost has been the subject of much consideration and argument. The awfulness of the sentence, 'hath never forgiveness,' must ever awaken in men's minds anxious thoughts for the future, and that not only in the case of those who really endeavour to walk in holiness of life, but also in the case of all others : for men generally persuade themselves that there is some hope for them in the largeness of God's mercy, even though they now reject the law of Christ, and disregard the restraints of the Gospel. Thus both religious and irreligious persons feel an interest in fathoming the meaning and extent of this remarkable saying of our Lord, and according to the different estimation in which men

have held certain doctrines, or certain practices, they have arrived at conclusions widely different on the subject of the unpardonable sin.

A very short reference to the opinions of the ancients on this subject will be sufficient¹. The most notable is that of S. Augustine, who determines that the sin against the Holy Ghost is the obstinate rejection of the Christian religion, or the offer of remission of sins made by the Holy Ghost, through Christ, in the new covenant. And the most forcible argument he brings for his view is, that not only all Jews and pagans, but all heretics are supposed upon their repentance to be capable of salvation: and therefore *Final* impenitency must be the blasphemy which has neither remission in this world, nor in the world to come².

The consequence of his view is that no man can be said to have committed the unpardonable sin so long as he is alive, and therefore that the warning against it is of a very peculiar and indefinite kind, and can hardly be said to be practical in any degree; and besides this, the opinion referred to omits to notice some particulars which holy Scripture gives us of the characteristics of this sin, to which we shall refer hereafter.

S. Cyprian, as was natural in one of his temperament, applied the scriptural denunciation

¹ See *Bingham's Antiquities*, Book xvi. c. vii. § 3, for the authorities referred to.

² *S. Augustine, Sermo xi. de Verbis Domini*, cc. iii, xiii, xxiv.

against those who in time of persecution apostatized from the truth, [as in his 16th Epistle, (p. 40)] and in each successive age, those who embraced the peculiar heresy which then was the object of the Church's censure were supposed to commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. S. Hilary and S. Athanasius consider that those who deny the divinity of the Son were guilty of it. S. Epiphanius, S. Ambrose, and Philastrius, charge those who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost with the unpardonable sin; only S. Ambrose attaches the condition of final impenitency, for he proclaims pardon to all who would return to the Church.

The Novatians extended the irremediable state to all who committed sin after baptism¹, a heresy revived in the time of the Reformation, and expressly condemned by the Church of England in the XVIth Article.

Modern theologians have taken more general views, and their opinions on the subject may be classed under two heads. They either suppose, that it was the conduct of the Pharisees to our Lord on the occasion when the words were uttered that is described as sin against the Holy Ghost, or that it was the conduct of those who, in after times, by similarly calumniating the gifts of the

¹ Origen and Theognostus according to S. Athanasius, Tom. i. p. 990, held this opinion: ὅταν οἱ καταξιωθέντες ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος πάλιν δρομήσωσιν εἰς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν. See his refutation of it. See also English translation of *Treatises against Arians*, Disc. i. c. xii. § 50, pp. 252, 3.

Spirit, should resist the full and perfect evidence which then was to be exhibited.

The most elaborate supporter of the latter view is Dr Whitby, but of the arguments he uses some seem to be untenable¹.

He says, 'That it is not any blasphemy against the Spirit in his miraculous operations, such as were casting out of devils, and healing of diseases, which is here styled the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. This being here done by the Pharisees against the Son of man, for he declareth (v. 28) that he did cast out devils by the Spirit of God; they therefore must blaspheme that Spirit by which our Saviour did this, by saying he cast out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils; and yet our Saviour saith that even the blasphemy against the Son of man should be forgiven, but it was properly the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.'

This seems to me confused and unconvincing. The casting out of devils is especially here referred to. Our Saviour affirms that He did this by the Spirit of God, or elsewhere by the finger of God, denoting in each case that the *Divine Energy* wrought this². The Pharisees, on the other hand,

¹ See *Dr Whitby's Paraphrase with Annotations on the New Testament*, Appendix IV. to S. Matthew's Gospel, 'Concerning the Nature of the Sin against the Holy Ghost,' § 3.

² Δάκτυλος Θεοῦ, δύναμις νοεῖται Θεοῦ, δι' ἧς ἡ κτίσις τελειοῦται οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς.—*Clem. Alex. Strom.* vi. p 681. Χριστὸς δάκτυλον ὠνόμασε τὸ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, λέγων, πότε μὲν, Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια πότε δὲ, Εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω

unable to deny the power, attributed to an evil spirit the work of the Spirit of God. And truly this was more properly blasphemy against the Holy Ghost than blasphemy against the Son of man. The miraculous operations which Christ wrought by the Spirit of God they did not deny, but attributed the power through which He wrought them to the evil spirit. It was the ascription of the supernatural power exercised by Christ to this source that called down upon them the denunciation. Thus in S. Mark's Gospel, after arguing with them of the absurdity of the supposition, and repeating the words, 'He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness,' the Evangelist adds, '*Because they said He hath an unclean spirit.*'

They did not deny Christ's miracles, but the power through which He wrought them: the blasphemous words spoken are therefore, not so much against Him, as against that spirit of power whose agency was here manifested. The supernatural work was assigned to Satan instead of the Holy Spirit, and the blasphemy was therefore against that Spirit¹. To suppose that it has reference to a future display of heavenly gifts by which the new covenant was to be attested, is surely to bring in here a meaning far removed from that which the narrative suggests. The Pharisees objected

τὰ δαιμόνια.—*Cyrrillus Alex. de Adoratione*, Lib. i. p. 8. See also *Isidorus Pelusiota*, Ep. LX. i. p. 19. *Theophylact on Luke xi.*

¹ See *S. Paciani, Epistola ad Sympronianum*, c. 32.

to the miracles which our Lord wrought as evidences of His Divine power. He warns them that this sin, if persisted in, was unpardonable, not that some future sin they might commit would be unpardonable. The warning loses its whole force if made to refer forward to a case which they could not comprehend, instead of expressly referring to their present contemptuous and injurious suppositions.

In favour of the interpretation to which we are now objecting it is further urged, that the Pharisees could not yet have committed the unpardonable sin, for if they had been guilty of it, our Lord could not afterwards have prayed for their forgiveness, or offered them any further terms of mercy and salvation; and yet on the cross He prayed for the Pharisees and rulers, ‘Father, forgive them, they know not what they do;’ and further on, He says He will send the Holy Ghost to convince them of sin; and S. Peter says that they crucified our Lord ignorantly, ‘as did also your rulers.’

There seems here a fallacy lurking in the use of the word ‘unpardonable¹.’ All state of sin must bring death. Any wilful sin persisted in against warning and without repentance must work death eternal. But in every case *persistence* in sin must be understood, and persistence in *wilful* sin.

¹ It is called *θανατικὴ ἁμαρτία* by Ecumenius and Athanasius; *ἀναπόμπτος* by Cyril of Alexandria; and *ἀναπότριπτος, ἄφικτος* by S. Basil—*ἀναπολόγητος* and *ἀσυγχώρητος*.

When we pray to God in the Litany that it may please Him to have mercy upon all men, we do this rightly, because we read that God would have all men to be saved ; but we do not mean to pray to Him that He will give them eternal life *while* they remain in sin, or die in alienation from Him. The meaning of 'unpardonable' is not that it is impossible that such a sin should be pardoned, even upon repentance, but the absolute and entire want of all plea of mitigation, such as ignorance, weakness, misinformation, want of clearness, feeble understanding. When S. John bids us not pray for the brother who commits the sin unto death, we must understand him as telling us that the only plea that can be urged for deliverance of such an one from punishment is in this case non-existent, and therefore that it would be wrong to ask God to excuse and pardon on the score of frailty or ignorance, a wilful rejection of what He himself hath given to save us from perdition.

I cannot perceive that there is any inconsistency in proclaiming a certain sin to be unpardonable, and yet also praying that men may repent of that sin. If we may charitably and properly intreat of the Almighty that He would turn away all his erring creatures from sin ; this means that leaving their errors they may be converted unto Him ; that faith and charity may be given them, and that out of the darkness of ignorance they may come to the knowledge of

His truth¹; and if this is right and reasonable, generally, especially must it be so when the sin is one to remain in which is eternal death. When Christ prayed for his murderers, it was because of their ignorance that he prayed their sin, in all its horror, might not be imputed to them—‘Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.’ This is different from a prayer that they might repent. Christ himself prayed not for the impenitent. ‘I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me out of the world.’ The world, as such, lieth in wickedness, but *may* repent and be saved. The denunciation of the unpardonable nature of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost I understand in the same sense, not as meaning impossibility of repentance², and forgiveness upon repentance, but rather as indicating,—(1) that all pleas in arrest of punishment, such as weakness, ignorance, and want of understanding, are in this case excluded, and,—(2) that it is a sin which tends to the state of hardened impenitence.

We have further to consider the meaning of the phrase, ‘The Holy Ghost was not yet given,’

¹ *Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, B. v. c. 49, § 6, quoting Prosper.

² *S. Athanasius, de Communi Essentia Trium Personarum*, Tom. I.: σημειώσασθαι χρῆ ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ βλασφημήσαντι καὶ μετανοοῦντι, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται, ἀλλὰ τῷ βλασφημοῦντι, εἴτ' οὖν, τῷ ἐν τῇ βλασφημίᾳ ἐπιμένοντι· ἐπειδὴ περ οὐκ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία ἀσυγχώρητος παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς γνησίως καὶ κατ' ἀξίαν μετανοοῦσι. I do not quote this for its *accuracy* since τῷ βλασφημήσαντι is used in S. Luke xii. 10; but the idea is the same as that which is maintained above.

or, as it is in the Greek text, 'The Holy Ghost was not yet,' which is urged as another reason why the Pharisees could not at this time have committed the unpardonable sin. Christ there is speaking of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, by which the new dispensation was to be attested, or in other words, to the new manifestation of the Spirit; for that the Spirit of God in His ordinary operations (and also in His extraordinary, in time of old,) was even then present with men, though not in the same degree of influence upon their hearts as He was to be hereafter, is testified by those words which Christ addressed to the Apostles, 'He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' The Holy Spirit strove with men before the ascension of Christ, as may be shewn from many records of the Scriptures, His agency being less direct and less individual than under the Christian covenant. Even while our Lord was Himself appealing to His teaching which was the result of His anointing with the Holy Ghost, and His supernatural works which He wrought by the Spirit of Power, this same Spirit certainly was striving with the hearts and consciences of all who listened and beheld. It was that Spirit which the Baptist saw descending upon the Son of man, when He entered upon His solemn office; and though the singular confirmation which the Holy Spirit wrought at the day of Pentecost was yet wanting, there was nevertheless, undoubtedly, in the fact of Christ's miracles a testimony of the Holy Spirit,

and the rejection of this testimony constituted a sin against the third Person of the Blessed Trinity.

We are therefore inclined to consider that the sin of the Pharisees was the rejecting the evidence of the miracles, done by Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit, in order to attest his mission from the Father. It was peculiarly a sin against the Holy Ghost, we are told; and the most obvious circumstance upon which we can fasten the attention is this error of theirs in rejecting the work of the Holy Ghost, the proof and credential of the divine origin of the system, rather than the system itself. The former no doubt entailed the latter, but its guilt is to be measured by other rules than those which will be applied to the case of men who reject the whole system from ignorance or misapprehension.

We must notice, too, that S. John speaks of it as a sin which is committed *in* the Church: 'If any man see his BROTHER sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them which sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death. I do not say that he shall pray for it.' So of old to the Church in Judæa. Jeremiah proclaims like fruitlessness of intercession for those who would not hear the messengers: 'Because I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not. Therefore will I do unto this house which is called by my name as I have done to Shiloh. Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither

lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession for them, for I will not hear thee.'

If then we apply to ourselves the warning which this denunciation of the heinousness of the unpardonable sin may suggest, we should conclude that its guilt is incurred by those who discredit and reject the miraculous evidences of Christianity, while yet they call themselves Christians¹. At first sight this may appear to be an inference considerably removed from the case of the Pharisees, and not to follow very obviously from what has been said in opposition to the view which Dr Whitby and others have adopted. And it will therefore be necessary to establish the conclusion by means of a somewhat extended argument.

We shall endeavour to shew, in the first place, that the work of convincing men of any divine truth is generally in Scripture said to be that of the Holy Spirit.

2. That when God vouchsafes to man peculiar and special proofs of his being the author of a Revelation, there must be deep and grievous sin in rejecting such evidence, tendered as it were by God to man.

3. That though in a certain sense the internal character of the revelation should be a subject of investigation before we yield to the external evidence, yet such internal character alone cannot

¹ See *Bede*, quoted by *Fulke*, *Rhemish Testament*, on 1 John v. 16.

convince without the corroborating testimony of miraculous powers in the teacher.

4. That we are to conclude that the sin against the Holy Ghost may be committed now by those who reject the miracles and prophecies of Scripture, notwithstanding they claim the name of Christian, and profess belief in Christ as the author of a system of moral reformation.

In the first place, then, the divine action upon the hearts and intellects of men is especially described to us as the work of the Holy Ghost.

This work is of two kinds, internal influence, or external sign. The former direct, the latter indirect. The direct action of the Holy Spirit upon men's hearts may be either of the nature of *suasion*, and then it requires willingness on the part of the subject of the influence exerted, and partakes of the nature of the latter or external influence, being not irresistible; or it may be irresistible, reducing the human being on whom it is exerted to an instrument, and in this case it is generally meant to produce an indirect action upon others.

The first kind of internal influence is the striving of the Spirit of God with man's conscience, and we are taught that there is this one great mark of the new covenant, that all who are called by God's grace into the fold of Christ in this world are subject to the Spirit's strivings, they are illuminated, having a conscience touched by a coal from the altar of God, and are thus made

sensible of the warfare between the flesh of the carnal element, and the Spirit or the heavenly element. 'The Spirit lusteth against the flesh, and the flesh against the Spirit, in order that ye may not do the things to which ye are inclined naturally.' And the absence of this striving of the Spirit is the state of unconverted heathenism, or of spiritual death and reprobation. 'Know ye not that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you, except ye be reprobate?'

Of the second kind of internal influence is the action of the Holy Ghost on the minds of the prophets, properly called Inspiration. This is directly asserted to be the case in times of old in such passages of Scripture as the following :

When Saul was chosen of the prophet Samuel he was told that on meeting the children of the schools of the prophets, the Spirit of the Lord should come upon him, and, animated with a supernatural energy, he should join their sacred band, and utter words dictated by divine influence.

'And it was so, that when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart, and all those signs came to pass that day. And when they came thither to the hill, behold, a company of prophets met him, and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied among them.'

When Jehoram and Jehoshaphat went out against Moab, and, at the request of the latter, the advice of Elisha was sought, the prophet calls for a

minstrel. 'And it came to pass, while the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him, and he prophesied.'

Isaiah, in prophetic trance, describes himself as acted on in the same manner, and was under this influence when the vision of glory was vouchsafed to him in the temple¹.

Similar to these is the instance recorded of Abraham, who in the horror of thick darkness saw a mysterious representation of the acceptance of his sacrifice by God, the burning lamp passing between the pieces which had been divided, as was the method of making a covenant (Jer. xxxiv. 19—28); that of Balaam also, who, being himself an unwilling agent, was made subject to the divine power when the Spirit of God came upon him, and in his parable he uttered words which proclaimed the utter failure of his covetous and selfish schemes. In the new dispensation we have S. John declaring himself to be in the Spirit when he had revealed to him the fortunes of the Christian Church to the end of the world; and those who, in the early ages of Christianity, had the gift of tongues, must have been under the same kind of direct internal influence; their personality or individuality being for the time absorbed in the presence of the mighty, mysterious agent who led and controlled them.

The most abundant exercise of the direct internal influence is no doubt that of prophecy,

¹ See also of *Azariah*, 1 Chron. xv. 1.

in which the subjects of God's marvellous work are said to be out of themselves (*ἐξεστηκέναι*), and the peculiar state of mental trance in which prophets are (*τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ μάντεως* of S. Chrysostom), is one in which the subject is transported or elated by a divine power (*θεοφορούμενος*). Men in this state are said to be in an *ἔκστασις*, when, as Hammond says, the outward senses being bound up as it were in sleep, God's will is inwardly revealed to the understanding by way of intellectual vision.

Now it is apparent to every one that this inspiration is said unambiguously to be the work of the Holy Ghost. 'Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and not of their own motion or setting free' (*ἐπίλυσις*)¹, and thus we have all the internal influence upon men's minds attributed to the Divine Spirit, both that which is personal and private, and meant for their own edifying, and also that which is prophetic, and meant for the edification of the Church.

Moreover, of the external influences, or those interferences with the natural order of things which are of the nature of signs, we also have it expressly recorded that the Holy Ghost is the Author. Othniel's valour, Saul's zeal for the men of Jabesh, Sampson's feats of strength, exhibited as a sign to the Philistines, are said to be the work of the Spirit of God; and strange events, which were apprehended only, are ascribed to the agency of the Spirit, as when Obadiah expressed

¹ 2 S. Peter i. 20, 21.

his fears to Elijah, lest he should be mysteriously carried away, while he delivered the prophet's message to the King of Israel his master. And the sons of the prophets, when they were doubtful of the reality of Elijah's translation, conjectured the possibility of his having been carried away by the Spirit of the Lord, as in after times Philip was from the Ethiopian eunuch.

The miraculous manifestations of the day of Pentecost, and all those which were granted as signs and wonders to convince the unbelieving at the outset of Christianity, are affirmed by S. Paul, both gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, and their interpretation, to have been wrought by that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will. When he says, that God bore witness to the first messengers of Christianity by signs and wonders, by divers miracles and gifts, he ascribes them directly to this source, and affirms that they were the gift of the Holy Ghost¹.

Even in the case of our Blessed Saviour, the significant events of His life, as well as the power exercised supernaturally, are all ascribed to the Holy Ghost. It is not necessary to do more than mention the Incarnation and Miraculous Conception through the power of the Holy Ghost, the temptation in the wilderness to which He was led of the Spirit, the expiatory sacrifice, of

¹ See Romans xv. 18, 19, and *Bishop Terrot's Paraphrase*, in loco.

which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes that, through the eternal Spirit Christ offered Himself without spot to God; or the resurrection, in reference to which S. Peter says that Christ was quickened by the Spirit after His passion.

When inaugurated to His prophetic office, it was by the Holy Ghost visibly descending upon Him, the fact itself being accompanied by an attestation from heaven, and this is called afterwards, in reference to a passage in the prophecy of Isaiah (lxi. 1), 'The Spirit of the Lord being upon him.' With this came the bestowal of other extraordinary powers and gifts, as Christ is said by S. Peter (Acts x. 38) to be 'anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power:' and in virtue of this effusion and unction He Himself says that He cast out devils through the Spirit of God (S. Matth. xii. 28).

In all these cases of external effects wrought as signs we have it affirmed that God's Holy Spirit was the real agent: so that we think it is clearly made out from the Holy Scriptures, that, as a general assertion, the means internal and external used by the Almighty for influencing men's minds to the acceptance of His laws and revelations are specially ascribed to the agency of the Holy Ghost.

As far as it is internal and direct, we must suppose this agency to have been employed more or less at all times. S. Peter speaks of the Spirit

striving with men before the flood, and S. Stephen addresses the Jewish rulers as resisting the Holy Ghost in the same way and degree that the Fathers had done¹. We must, however, undoubtedly conclude from the words of our Saviour that such striving of the Spirit was not universal, as it is promised to be under the Christian dispensation. That the Holy Ghost strove with the Pharisees during the time they heard our Lord's teaching we cannot doubt, but still on the occasion to which the words of the text refer, He was reproofing them for resisting something more than the ordinary influence which was by preaching brought to bear upon their hearts. In the one case we may call the work of the Holy Ghost the subjugation of the affections of men, and in the other it is the subjugation of their intellects; and we are justified in forming this distinction by the words of the Sacred Record,—irrational as it may seem, philosophically speaking: undoubtedly when the judgment is convinced, obedience ought to follow; but it seems to be a law of mankind that the affections do not necessarily follow the judgment. Many believe in the truth of the Christian religion, whose faith comes short even of that of the fallen spirits, and do not even tremble at the

¹ Nehemiah ix. 20: 'Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them.' Numbers xi. 17; Isaiah lxiii. 11. On this subject see S. Athanasius's *Treatises against Arianism*, (Oxf. Transl.) p. 236 and note there; p. 249. As to the heresy which taught that the Spirit which spake in the prophets was different from that which speaks now in the Apostles of Christ, see *Origen on Titus*, t. 4, p. 695.

alternative which awaits them according to their own convictions. Thus it is said that ‘many of the Jews believed in Jesus when they saw the miracles that He did;’ yet He would not trust Himself to these persons, because He knew their hearts were not subdued to His doctrine, while yet their understandings were convinced by His miracles. And there were many of the Jews who would not recognize Him as the Messias, who yet, it is said, believed on Him on account of His miracles. ‘Many of the people believed on Him, and said, When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done?’ Many even among the chief rulers believed, who would not confess Him ‘because of the Pharisees, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.’ Simon Magus, when he saw the miracles of Philip ‘believed,’ though he was ‘yet in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity;’ and this faith, which is not the belief of the heart with which man ‘believeth unto justification’ (Rom. x. 10), was wrought in many, without doubt, by the exhibition of supernatural power: *all* convictions being the work of the Holy Ghost;—both the conviction of the *judgment*, by wonders and signs,—and the conviction of the *heart*, by which the affections are influenced: but the two, not being necessarily or universally joined together, being neither wrought by the same means nor at the same time. Now all the external influence,

and the indirect internal influence, must tend to the former object rather than the latter,—to compel the recognition of the divine origin of Christianity rather than to bring home its soul-subduing power to the heart. And we have been specially concerned to shew on this occasion that the works which the Divine Wisdom has appointed for the conviction of man's judgment, in miracles and signs and wonders, are throughout revelation generally called the works of the Holy Spirit, in order to prove that it is these supernatural evidences which were the subject of the argument between our Lord and his objectors, and to make it clear that when he denounced upon them so terrible a woe, it was because they rejected *these signs*, and in rejecting them, they in some manner specially rejected the testimony of the Holy Ghost, and committed blasphemy against Him.

Not only must we keep in mind the distinction between the influence of the Holy Ghost on men's hearts, and the workings of the same Divine Spirit for convincing the judgment, we must also notice a very considerable difference between the former influence, as promised, and now exercised under the Christian dispensation,—and the general testimony to the existence and moral government of God which the natural order of the universe furnishes. It is important to call attention to this distinction, because of the words of our Saviour and His apostles, indicating a general action of the Spirit on all the members of the new cove-

nant, as a characteristic of that covenant; a distinction of which we shall hereafter have to make use of when we urge more closely the conclusion to which we are tending. To the heathen, S. Paul tells us, 'God hath not left himself without witness.' This is the New Testament recognition of what is called Natural Religion. All men may, to a certain degree, from the works of creation learn a testimony of God against unrighteousness. 'The eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood from things created.' 'The heavens declare the glory of God.' And in this sense, God is 'not far from any one of the sons of men.' Now, be it observed, the Pharisees did not reject this testimony, and therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost is not the rejection of such truths as may be learned from the works of God, without revelation. Neither can it be the teaching of the Son of man, i. e. of Christ in His human capacity; for it is the distinction between this teaching and something else that makes the chief point in our Lord's denunciation. It is not the resistance to that doctrine, which is here intended, heart-searching though it be, and fatal as may be the result of obduracy. Ignorance and want of mental capability may, to a certain extent, be bars to the reception of certain doctrines affirmed only by the Son of man, even though He spake as never man spake. It must therefore be resistance to the truth when coming with undeniable authority,

an authority divine, and therefore specially the resistance to the demonstration of the Spirit, that attestation which through the Divine Spirit our Lord gave to His teaching, and to which He appealed when He gave answer to the inquiries of John's disciples, 'Go and tell John again the things which ye do hear and see. The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have the Gospel preached to them.' It was the rejecting these signs and wonders wrought through the power of the Spirit of God, that made the case of Chorazin and Bethsaida so much worse than that of the heathen, because they would not be convinced by the mighty works which had been done in them. When Christ upbraided these cities, in which most of His mighty works had been done, He was using the same argument which the Almighty had addressed in olden time to Ezekiel, 'Thou art not sent to a people of strange speech and hard language. Surely had I sent thee to them, they would have hearkened unto thee.' And when our Lord said, 'If ye believe not me, believe the works,' He was drawing the distinction which He here urges on the Pharisees. Powerful and convincing as ought to have been the teaching of the Son of man, yet if this prevailed not, there was the still stronger testimony of the mighty works, the works of the Holy Ghost. 'If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.' To reject these was to

reject the testimony of the Holy Ghost, and incur the guilt of the unpardonable sin¹.

We conclude, therefore, that the rejection of the supernatural testimony given by Christ is the sin against the Holy Ghost, peculiarly and emphatically so described, and thus that it consists in the rejection of the evidence offered by Christ that He was sent from God, rather than in the opposition of the corrupt element in man to the ordinary striving of the Spirit, or the testimony of creation to the divine attributes.

The peculiar malignity of this sin should be the next subject for our consideration, and the reason why it should call for so fearful a sentence.

First, it proceeds, as S. John testifies, from an obstinate and hardened disposition. ‘Though He had done so many miracles, yet they believed not on Him.’ ‘That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord who hath believed our report and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed; therefore they could not believe².’ ‘And because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their

¹ *Photius, Ep. cxxvii. p. 167, &c.*: τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπικωτέρων καὶ ταπεινωτέρων σκανδαλισθεῖσιν ἐπὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ Χριστῷ, ῥαδία ἢ διὰ τῶν μειζόνων καὶ ὑψηλοτέρων μεταβολῇ καὶ ἡ ἄφεςις. τοῖς δὲ πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ καὶ θεῖα ἀπονοηθεῖσι, παγχάλεπος ἢ καὶ ἀδύνατος ἢ διόρθωσις. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οὐδεμία τῶν πλημμεληθέντων ἀπαντήσκει ἄφεςις.

² On this punctuation, see Alford.

eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.' And in the next place, when they proceeded to attribute to the evil spirit, or to an alliance of the Saviour with the power of Satan, that authority which He undoubtedly exercised, they were rejecting God's own testimony to His own work in the most offensive manner.

If God suspended His own laws in order to prove that Christ was sent from Him; if He gave to Jesus the Son of man power over creation, to alter, suspend, and abrogate for a time the laws by which He governs the universe, it cannot be a light matter to reject such undeniably powerful testimony. Such refusal to accept God's own witness of Himself is called tempting and wearying God, and tremendous woes were denounced upon the house of David to Ahaz when this evil disposed king refused to ask for a sign, God having offered to convince him by some extraordinary exercise of power. The peculiar wickedness of rejecting the evidences of the divine origin of Christianity as distinguished from rejecting the doctrine itself arises out of this, that the latter is a man's sin against himself, but the former is destructive of the faith of others. It is in moral and spiritual matters akin to the fiendish spirit which in ordinary life is manifested by those who not only delight in iniquity, but endeavour to break down in the innocent the barriers set up against vice; who not only hate what is virtuous

and good, but take pleasure in infusing their hateful principles into the hearts of others. So in the case we are considering, the attempted destruction of the evidences of divine authority in our Saviour is putting a stumblingblock in the path of the blind, and offending the little ones that believe in Christ; than which it were 'better that a man had a millstone hanged about his neck, and that he were cast into the sea,' i. e. the penalty of such a crime is greater than personal destruction.

If the greatness of salvation is attested by the singular confirmation which God gave to it in signs and wonders, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as is affirmed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, proportionably great must be the condemnation incurred by those who not only refuse that salvation, but malign, and distort, and slander the proofs which God gave of His having sent a revelation to mankind¹.

What greater offence against the majesty of God than the imputation thus cast upon Him, that He permitted Satan to contrive lying wonders, even against Himself, to deceive mankind in the things which are of the most unbounded importance to them; and that, too, in order to teach

¹ The author of the *Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, Qu. CVIII. says of the Jews forbidding the Apostles, ἐκτελεῖν θεῖα ἔργα ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος γινόμενα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκουσίου ἀγνοίας συγγνώμην ἐφελκομένης ἀλλ' ἐγνωσμένης ἐκουσίου θεομαχίας τιμωρίαν ἐφελκομένης.

truth and honesty? The absurdity of the charge is in aggravation of its wickedness. When the object of God's interference is really to promote men's happiness, and rescue them from the dominion of sin, to relieve them from the bondage to which they are subject, and bring them into the glorious liberty of sons of God;—while *this* is the object,—it yet charges the Deity with being in league with the enemy of God and man for the cheating and misleading of mankind.

Surely such a sin is rebellion of the deepest dye, an insult of the most unpardonable kind. It charges God's message to men with falsehood, his condescension with malignity, his spontaneous offer of the most convincing proofs with cruelty and deception. If a messenger from heaven, to prove his mission, claims divine power, and actually exercises it,—when it is rejected, despised, insulted, what further proof can be given? If insinuations or broad assertions of falsehood are made against the works of the very finger of God, can we conceive that any denunciation of punishment for such wickedness is too strong, any penalty too severe for the crime? 'Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker.'—Is. xlv. 9.

God deals with us as with rational creatures, offering us proofs and signs, when He would convince us of any extraordinary display of His good will towards us: to defeat His gracious purpose is the object of the evil one, and to help this opposition in such a way as not only to frustrate the

grace of God in ourselves, but to undermine and destroy the faith of others, is a *sin* the magnitude of which we can hardly conceive ; and the denunciation of our Lord upon those who commit it, does not appear to us, when we thus reflect upon it, at all disproportionate to the offence.

LECTURE VI.

S. MATTHEW XII. 31, 32.

All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men : but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him : but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

THERE are and have been always persons who undervalue the testimony from miracles : and some who endeavour to shew there can be no such thing as a miracle, who yet profess belief in the Christian religion, after a certain manner of their own. Of course such a belief in Christianity does not include a belief in the Scriptures as *inspired* writings, it merely regards them as the productions of enthusiasts, recording the prevalent opinions of their day, or wrapping up prejudices in a garb of history, or mistaking allegories or figures for actual historical events.

One plan adopted by them is to magnify the moral evidence of Christianity, or the beauty of Christian morality ; and to make IT *alone* a

convincing proof of the Divine origin of the system, to exalt it above the external evidence, and thus induce men to undervalue the latter, and make them less anxious about maintaining it.

It is therefore an important question, on which to have clear and definite views, whether external evidence precedes or follows the internal; and in this way the question has been stated: but the inquiry soon made it evident that this is of uncertain determination; it requires the discussion of another question, ‘Must not the character of the doctrine be examined in order to guard against deception?’ We find warnings such as these, That false prophets may arise; that there are agents of evil, who may pretend to supernatural power, working signs and wonders, which might deceive even God’s chosen ones; and that we are to try the spirits, whether they are of God, i. e. decide on the doctrine before we admit the evidence as conclusive.

On the other hand, how can we know that a teacher is sent from God? If the doctrine is above what we could reach by unassisted reason, how *can* our reason, uninfluenced by the evidence of miraculous power, admit it as divine? If it be beyond what we know of God’s ways, how can we be judges of its congruity? And again, how can the majority of mankind be convinced, as they are often incapable of forming correct conclusions on the internal evidence of the divine origin of Christianity?

Thus it must be an important practical question, especially in arguing with the heathen, 'What should be the course of the Christian missionary, who has no present power of miracles to appeal to?'

When our Saviour says, 'If ye believe not me, believe the works,' does he intimate that his personal character, or the character of his doctrine ought to have produced belief, and that the miracles were only a secondary proof? This must be answered from a review of the general method of his teaching.

When He warns His disciples that there should be false Christs who should arise, or when S. Paul tells us that antichrist should have the power of working miracles; does this shew that signs and wonders are not a safe proof of divine origin, not the primary evidence on which we ought to rely? This must be answered from the way in which Christ himself speaks of the works which He did in confirmation of His mission.

Before proceeding to these questions, we may endeavour to set aside one prejudice, that has been entertained against the external evidence of Christianity. We ought not indeed to argue for the value of external evidence, as if it were itself Christianity: though such evidence may awaken attention, it cannot prevail to convince absolutely the minds of thoughtful men¹, unless it be shewn

¹ In this sense it is that *Archbishop Laud* reasons of the insufficiency of miracles to produce saving Faith, or absolute conviction. See *Conference with Fisher*, § 16. The objections which *Sterling* made (*Essays*, Vol. II. p. 121) are referred to here.

at the same time that the system in aid of which it comes is a spiritual system ; that it relates to man's highest interests, i. e. to his relations with the Infinite and the Spiritual. It is not right to say that any system whatever, attested by signs and wonders, must command men's instant submission. It is here that the power of the Gospel as a moral and spiritual system makes itself felt. Let the attention be powerfully arrested by the display of heaven-sent power, and then arises the inquiry as to the substance of the things taught. And as it is in subservience of the spiritual system of Christianity that the external physical signs have been wrought, so in this sense ought they to be made secondary ; that is, they cannot be of any value in themselves, as distinguished from the doctrines of which they come in aid. The regeneration of man is the great object, and for this the internal work of the Spirit is necessary. The external testimony is subordinate in quality, though it come first in order of time, to that internal testimony which really works the transformation of man.

This leads us back to a proposition which has been already stated, that the conviction of the understanding is a very different thing from the subjugation of the heart and affections. The difficulties raised on the subject are generally started by philosophical inquirers, who have concluded too hastily, what might be assumed to be true in the case of the conscientious and truth-seeking ;

viz. that when the judgment is convinced, submission of the will must necessarily follow. Now the whole history of the first propagation of Christianity shews that this is not the case. Men *were* convinced by the signs wrought by the Apostles and apostolic men, that Christianity was sent from God, and were admitted to the brotherhood, whose lives and tenets have subsequently proved that the system had no deep hold on their hearts and wills. The external evidence was sufficient to bring them to a knowledge of the divine origin of the Gospel; and this was a necessary step towards the great object which it was intended to put before them, and work out in them; but they have then resisted the internal influence of the Spirit, and so not been the subjects of the further work of conversion of the heart to God. Such men were considered afterwards by some to be anomalies. The case was argued thus: the object of Christ's mission was to bring men into a spiritual union with the Deity, to reconcile man to his Creator; and here this object seems to have failed; then it was rashly assumed that because the evidence given to them did not lead to any subjugation of the will, it must therefore be useless. The early apologists for Christianity, while they argued against the heathen from the purity of the Gospel, and the self-denial of its converts, never omit to dwell with an emphasis and a confidence which now stagger us, on the supernatural powers which they exercised. Every one is acquainted with the celebrated

passage in Tertullian's Apology¹, where he challenges the proof of the Divine power wielded by Christians of expelling evil spirits, and extorting from persons possessed with familiar spirits a confession of the evil origin of the influence. Even those who hesitate to conclude from such passages the actual enjoyment of the privilege laid claim to, will not at any rate fail to notice the method used in arguing with the heathen; they cannot fail to conclude that those who believe in the miraculous events recorded in the gospel will be following in the wake of their predecessors in the faith; if they should now argue with the heathen in like manner, and urge upon them the fact that God did attest the Gospel to be from him by signs and wonders². It is singular to notice, that in many cases there is little difficulty in getting opponents to admit this, for example, in the controversy with the Mahometans³. *They* will readily agree that miracles may have been wrought, but

¹ *Apology*, c. 23. See Note in the Oxford Translation, where reference is given to many other passages of the early Christian writers affirming the same fact, such as *Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph.* 191 D. (Venice Edition, 1747) *Apolog.* II. § 6.

² An instance from *Justin Martyr* will be sufficient to shew this. *Dial. c. Tryphone*, § 11: Καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρακολουθούσης δυνάμεως συνιέναι πᾶσι δυνατόν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν, (sc. Ἰησοῦς) ὁ καινὸς νόμος, καὶ ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη καὶ ἡ προσδοκία τῶν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνῶν ἀναμενόντων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθὰ. See also § 39 and § 69.

³ See *Penrose's Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles*; *Archdeacon Goddard's Bampton Lectures for 1823*; *Martyr's Controversial Tracts*.

they require an investigation into the doctrine. Now while Christianity lends itself freely to this doctrinal inquiry, that is no reason why we should neglect the previous argument from external evidence of miracles, because in a particular case it has but little weight. If we neglect this testimony of God's favour, we may hear a man not unreasonably say: 'If the Christian religion is so important—if it is intended, as you say, to embrace all mankind,—and its precepts and doctrines are to have such a world-wide influence,—how is it that the Father of mankind has not given us some sign whereby we may really know that this is His will and His work?' S. Paul arguing with the Athenians appealed to a miraculous event, the resurrection of Christ, as proving that we should have to give an account of ourselves at God's judgment-seat; he says that this is an assurance unto all men of the truth which he preached¹.

If instead of going to the philosophical, who do not represent the majority of mankind, we turn to the records of those who represent a more numerous class, we shall find that they believe because there is an evidence, to them satisfactory, of God's having proved the Divine origin of Christianity by miraculous interposition. For example, in the

¹ *S. Chrysostom, Homil. xxxii. in S. Matt.*, giving a reason for the cessation of miracles, is arguing with Gentiles, who objected to Christianity that it was not confirmed by miracles to convince them, or with the people, who required an abundant display of such signs. In either case it shews that there is a natural craving for this kind of testimony.

24th book of Dante's Paradise¹, where the poet is represented as conversing with S. Peter, the Apostle asks him what is the foundation of his confidence; and his reply is that he was certain of the faith, because so many great works were wrought to prove it, works which nature could not produce in her ordinary operations; and when further asked, what proof he had that these miracles were wrought, he replies that if the world had been Christianized without the aid of miracles, this of itself would be so marvellous a thing, that all the others, if multiplied a hundred times, would not come up to it.

There may, on the other hand, be some who have dwelt upon the spiritual necessities of mankind, and the character of God, who feel the burden of sin, and the impediments which this places to their hopes of pleasing Him, and obtaining the wished for immortality. To such the character of Christ and that of His doctrine come

¹ *Dante, Il Paradiso, Canto xxiv. 97—108, quoted by Stillingfleet in the Origines Sacræ :—*

L'antica e la novella
 Proposizione che si ti conchiude
 Perchè l'hai tu per divina favella?
 Ed io : La prova che il ver mi dischiude
 Son l'opere seguite, a che natura
 Non scaldò ferro mai nè battè ancude.
 Risposto fummi : Di', chi t' assicura
 Chè quell' opere fosser? Quel medesimo
 Che vuol provarsi, non altri il ti giura.
 Se il mondo si rivolse al cristianesimo
 Diss'io, senza miracoli, quest' uno
 E tal, che gli altri non sono il centesimo.

like the rain upon the parched fields, or the dew on the scorched pasture; they are swayed by the exact adaptation of the Gospel to their wants; the doctrines of pardon, and regeneration, and sanctification come to them with a Divine power; their congruity with the yearnings of their hearts works in them conviction of the truth of the spiritual message. The Holy Ghost strives with them internally and directly; they do not resist his strivings, they yield to His blessed influence, and believe to the saving of their souls. It is not a mere barren assent which they make, because compelled by strong external evidence. They have the flood of Divine light poured at once in large measure into their souls, and their faith avails to cleanse the conscience. It is the answer of a good conscience towards God.

Faith is a joint act of the will and the understanding¹, but it need not be perfect in both its parts. That some men's understandings are convinced, and yet the subjugation of the will does not follow, is undoubtedly a moral anomaly: the understanding *ought* to influence the will, but unfortunately, in the fallen state of man, this is not the case, as a general rule. In those who yield themselves from conviction to the sway of the Gospel, who in the full and free exercise of an

¹ *Crede est Aetus intellectus determinati ad unum ex Imperio voluntatis.*—*S. Thomas*, 2. 2. q. 1. A. 1. c. quoted by *Archbishop Laud, Conference with Fisher*, § 16. *πίστις...ἐκούσιον τῆς ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσις.*—*Theodoret. θεραπειντ. Sermo 1. p. 479.*

informed understanding become the servants of Christ, this is the case. But how few are these, compared with the rest of mankind! On the other hand, there are many whose wills are subdued by the Spirit's internal influence, and this becomes to them a motive for inclining the understanding¹. This is more common. There are many whose sole reason for their faith is that they *feel* the truth of the Gospel. Somewhat similar is the case of the blind man whom our Lord found after the questioning of the Pharisees, and who in answer to the inquiry, 'Dost thou believe in the Son of God?' replied, 'Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on him?' His will was pliant,—he was ready, disposed towards eternal life², and so easily gave in his allegiance to the Gospel. Simon Magus had his understanding convinced, while his heart was unconverted.

I cannot help thinking that those who undervalue the external evidence of miracles do so very much from their assigning to it a wrong place. The spiritual power of the Gospel over the heart doubtless does not work by signs and wonders. This external evidence which the Holy Ghost gives, is not for the purifying of the heart; but for the arresting the attention, and convincing the understanding that the matter is from God. The internal

¹ *S. Augustin.* Sermo xviii. on *Ps.* 118: *Alia sunt quæ nisi intelligamus, non credimus; et alia sunt quæ nisi credamus, non intelligimus.* And again see the *Enarratio in Ps.* xxxv. *ad init.* on the Power of the Will over the Understanding.

² *Τεταγμένος εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* Act. Ap. xiii. 48.

striving of the Spirit must subdue men's hearts and consciences; and saving faith is rather the result of this latter process than of the former. When we read S. James arguing of the uselessness of faith without works, he is of course merely arguing of this effect upon the understanding; he means a dry and barren faith, which even the devils have. Men may believe that Christianity is a Divine scheme, without the understanding influencing the conduct in any rational degree. They sometimes harden their hearts against the pleadings of the Spirit of God, and they would not then believe, even if one rose from the dead; i. e. they would not believe to any purpose. Their faith would be a bald assent to certain historical truths, the correctness and certainty of which their judgments admitted; and from this conclusion they would not be able to escape. But there is a wonderful power of resistance in man, by which he strives against the conclusions of his own judgment; he *can* disregard what he knows to be true, and what he knows to be all important: and persons in whom this disposition predominates are extremely hostile to the Gospel and its requirements. We have instances in which our Lord would not extend the evidence which was intended to produce even this conviction, because the men to whom he was preaching were hardened and obstinate, and resisted the Holy Ghost. 'He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief.' Yet his ordinary method was according

to the answer to John's disciples : See the miracles, and hear me preach to the poor ; and the marvel of the unbelief of the people is ascribed by S. John to the hardened heart : ' Though he had done so many miracles, yet they believed not on him.'

We must not be led away from considering the real object of Christ's miracles, because in contemplating them we are impressed with their uniform benevolent tendency. Christ went about doing good, but it was not the primary object of his mission to minister to the temporal wants of man, to relieve sickness and poverty. It was to re-establish the broken covenant between God and man, to restore the human race to a high spiritual state, to repair the breaches, and build up again the damaged and broken pillars of the moral Temple of God ; that the Most High might take up his dwelling in the chambers of man's heart, and the whole family of man be restored to its original place in the creation. For the success of such high objects, besides the awful mystery of the Atonement, there was a necessity that He should tabernacle amongst us, veil the Deity in the Incarnation, and invite men by a reasonable appeal to their understandings and affections, to recognize the Divine message. And who amongst us is not at once prepared to say, that the readiest way to call the attention of mankind, is by the present exercise of Divine power before our eyes, appealing to the senses God has given us for the apprehension of all external Truth ? Who does

not immediately recognize the force of the Lord's appeal—'The works bear witness of me, that I am sent from God;' and this with the greater and more overwhelming cogency, when it is *habitual*? Bring hither the sick, the lame, the halt, the blind, and I will heal them. 'Whithersoever he went, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought him that they might but touch the border of his garment; and as many as touched were made perfectly whole.'

If miracles are not the most powerful of persuasives, if any other method could have had better success in prevailing with the multitude, and convincing them that Christ was a messenger from heaven¹, we ask, What is it? Would not Christ have employed it, if there were a stronger or a more palpable proof? and that he urged *it* as the proof we have His own direct assertion: 'If ye believe not me, believe the works,' must be taken in connexion with another place, where he says, 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true: my Father beareth witness of me:' and if we again ask, How? 'Because I do the works which none other man did. The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.' When they asked him, 'If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly,' Jesus answered, 'I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. If I do not the

¹ See *Penrose on Miracles*, c. iv.

works of my Father, believe me not. The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.' 'Believe me for the very works' sake.'

From consideration of this argument of our Lord, we conclude that he allowed that the objection made by the Pharisees to his pretensions would have been valid, *if* he had not had the testimony of the Father, as well as his own. As he here meant and was understood to be appealing to a testimony given him by God; what can we suppose it to mean, but an exercise of *Divine* power, a power which the Creator alone possessed over creation? The true order of the evidence appears to be as follows: the miracles proved that the person who performed them had Divine power: Christ therefore was a teacher from God, and therefore His teaching was true: hence His testimony concerning Himself was to be received, because it was supported by testimony from God, and He affirmed Himself to be the Messiah.

The miracles *were* wrought in proof of the doctrine, for Christ did not shew forth this Divine power till He entered upon his ministry, and his office of preaching. After that consider how large a portion of the record is taken up with the history of the miracles. It is not too much to say, that nearly one half of the Gospels is a history of Divine interposition in miracles of various kinds.

It was this display of power that convinced Nicodemus; 'We know that thou art a teacher sent from God; for no man can do the miracles that thou

doest, except God be with him.' It was the miracle at Cana which first induced belief in his disciples (S. John ii. 11), because by it he 'manifested forth his glory,' that is to say, their belief in him began to be of a higher kind; their previous discipleship must have been similar in some respect to that of John's disciples, 'who did no miracle,' but gained a considerable school (if we may so speak) by his preaching. As the Evangelist marks so strongly the effect of the first miracle, he must intimate that their previous belief in Christ was of a much lower kind than that which was then wrought; even though it was not yet that faith in Christ as the Son of God which S. Peter in the name of himself and his colleagues confessed so nobly on a subsequent occasion. We know, as a fact, that the *doctrine* at one time drove away many of his disciples (S. John vi. 66); and those that remained seem to intimate that, hard and difficult as the saying was, they remained faithful in spite of it, for some other reason which held them bound to Him: 'Lord, to whom should we go?' The form of the narrative when the Evangelist writes, 'Though he did so many miracles, yet they believed not on him¹,' implies that they ought to have believed in consequence of the number of these works; and therefore that with the multitude, it was the awakening evidence which first should turn them to listen to the words of Eternal Life; in the hope

¹ John xii. 37: *τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν.*

that afterwards the word might influence their affections and incline their wills permanently and effectually¹.

We next proceed to notice the objection which is made from the fact that Christ himself and the Apostles foretold that there should be signs and wonders wrought by false Christs, and which might deceive even the elect². If there can be miracles wrought by the agents of evil and of error, how can these be safe testimonies to the truth of one who professes himself sent from God?

This was the argument of Celsus the Epicurean. He puts forth with great confidence this objection to miraculous evidence—that Christ should have foretold that others would come and do miracles, to which they must give no heed. He thence infers that miracles have no special Divine power in them. Is it not, says he, a wretched thing that from the same works one should be accounted a God, and others deceivers³?

¹ S. Paul ad Romanos, xv. 18, says that the Gentiles were made obedient, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος ἁγίου.

S. Augustine, de Catechizandis Rudibus, § 45: Quemadmodum primi Christiani quia nondum ista (sc. prædicta) provenisse videbant, miraculis movebantur ut crederent; sic nos &c. He here compares the conviction produced in his day with that which was wrought in the beginning of Christianity, and assumes that the first Christians were first induced to belief by miracles.

² See this question argued at considerable length by Mr Penrose, *Treatise on Scripture Miracles*, c. v.

³ *Origenes c. Celsum, Lib. ii. p. 89 (Spencer's Edition)*: πῶς οὖν οὐ σχέτλιον, ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων τὸν μὲν, Θεόν, τοὺς δὲ, γόητας

To this Origen replies, Our Saviour did not in these words bid men beware in general of such as did miracles, but of those only who might announce themselves as anointed of God, and who should endeavour by some appearances (*διά τινων φαντασιῶν*) to convert the disciples of Jesus; and he also argues, that since false Christs pretended to be Christ *because* they worked miracles, it shews that the power of working miracles was generally taken to be conclusive as an evidence of Divine power¹.

If there be deceptions, there must be true miracles also. If there be sophisms, there must also be legitimate arguments; what must be done in such cases, is strictly and severely to examine the pretenders, their life and manners, their effects and consequences, whether they do good or hurt

ἠγείσθαι;—τί γὰρ μᾶλλον ἀπό γε τούτων, τοὺς ἄλλους πονηροὺς, ἢ τοῦτον νομιστέον, αὐτῷ χρωμένους μάρτυρι; ταῦτα μὲν γε καὶ αὐτὸς ὠμολόγησεν οὐχὶ θείας φύσεως, ἀλλ' ἀπατεῶνων τινῶν καὶ παμπονήρων εἶναι γνωρίσματα.

Ὅρα δὴ εἰ μὴ ἐν τούτοις ὁ Κέλσος σαφῶς ἐλέγχεται κακουργῶν τὸν λόγον· ἄλλο μὲν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντος περὶ τῶν ποιησάντων σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, ἄλλο δὲ τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαίου φάσκοντος· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἀπλῶς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔλεγεν Ἰησοῦς φυλάσσεσθαι τοὺς τὰ τεράστια (?) ἐπαγγελλομένους, οὐ παρατιθέμενος τί φήσουσιν ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι, τάχα χώραν εἶχεν ἂν ἡ ὑπόνοια αὐτοῦ· ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφ' ὧν θέλει φυλάσσεσθαι ἡμᾶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐπαγγέλλονται εἶναι ὁ Χριστὸς ὅπερ οὐ ποιοῦσιν οἱ γόητες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ βιοῦντας κακῶς φησὶ τινὰς δυνάμεις ποιῆσειν, καὶ δαίμονας ἀποβάλλειν ἀνθρώπων.

¹ *Ib.* lib. ii. p. 90: καὶ τοῦτο δὲ δοκεῖ μοι ἐπὶ πάντων ὥστε δεῖν παρατιθέναι ὅτι ὅπου τι χεῖρον προσποιοῦμενον εἶναι ὁμαγενὲς τῷ κρεῖττονι ἐκεῖ πάντως ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου ἐστὶ τι κρεῖττον· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ γοητείαν ἐπιτελούντων, ὅτι πάντως ἀνάγκη εἶναι καὶ ἀπὸ θείας ἐνεργείας ἐν τῷ βίῳ γενόμενα, &c. See also p. 91, *Spencer's Edition.*

in the world, whether they correct men's manners, and bring men to goodness, holiness, and truth. On this account we are neither to reject all miracles, nor embrace all pretences, but carefully and prudently examine the rational evidences whereby those which are true and Divine may be known from such as are counterfeit and diabolical.

The argument, when reiterated by modern objectors, has been answered by shewing clearly what criteria are reasonable or necessary to be observed in distinguishing pretended miracles or false signs from true. The chief of these is the congruity of the doctrine in support of which miracles are wrought, with that which has been supported and evidenced in the same way. No miracle can be admitted as a proof of Divine Authority, if it be wrought in contradiction of any tenet which is already agreed to proceed from Divine Authority¹. This is already provided for under the Mosaic law. 'If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto that prophet or dreamer of dreams.' The false prophet was to be put to death, because he spoke to turn them away from the Lord, i. e. the pretensions of the prophet were to

¹ See *Le Bas*, 'Considerations on Miracles,' p. 45.

be tried by his doctrine. S. John gives the same rule for trying the spirits, when he says that every spirit which is from God must confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.

In this there is nothing at all contrary to what we have said before; for in either case of true or false miracles, they serve to arrest the attention in the first instance, when considered and found to be clear of all suspicion and doubt: they incline the understanding, if found to be wanting in those fair and clear characteristics which an honest truth-seeking mind would apply: they cease to have any effect, and are easily, as is the case now with respect to pretended popish miracles, disregarded.

Few persons except those whose tendencies are already towards the Roman Communion, ever pay more than a mere passing attention to the foolish stories of miracles circulated in modern times. The nature of these pretended wonders, and the vain fables they are brought forward to support, both together convince us that there is no need to give any attention to them.

It is better, in speaking on a subject of this kind, to take a practical case, than to endeavour to make a subtle scientific distinction; for it would be hard to do this in such a way as to obviate all objections. The more useful way is to point out the emptiness of the cavil, and how completely uninfluential it is, when the case is one of actual occurrence. Such a method will at once shew us

that there is more subtlety than substance in the dilemma to which opponents would reduce us.

With respect to the Christian religion as a whole, the difficulty is purely theoretical; for there is not a single vestige of a case to be put in comparison with the multitudinous signs, and the perpetual wonderful exercise of power, which marked our Saviour's life on earth.

But it should be clearly stated that the distinction drawn between external and internal evidence of Christianity, is not one which can be maintained absolutely. Neither is one without the other. The external evidence calls men to hear. It is the awakening call of God to all his creatures. 'A great multitude followed him, *because* they saw the miracles which he did on them that were diseased.' (S. John vi. 2.) Those who heard his preaching, as from one who spake as never man spake, and one who had authority, probably believed that Christ was a prophet sent from God. Others hardened themselves against Him, and imputed his miracles to the Spirit of evil.

The former when they heard our Saviour proclaim the Gospel of the kingdom, if their hearts were not hardened, believed in Him more firmly, and became more than mere nominal disciples; but if they were lovers of the honour that cometh from men more than of that which cometh from God only, even though their consciences warned them that Christ was a Divine messenger, would

not confess Him, even though they believed (S. John xii. 42). They had convictions which they were afraid to avow openly (S. John vii. 13, ix. 22).

But those who not only rejected Christ's words, but maligned and traduced his great works, these men are said to commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. Now what was the difference between these last and those who, while touched, yet would not confess—but this? The Pharisees rejected Christianity AND its external evidence; the others through infirmity and love of the world rejected Christianity, but admitted the force of its evidence. And hence we conclude that the rejection of the external evidence in wonders and signs, the gifts of the Holy Ghost; the resolute setting oneself against the proofs that God himself, through the power of the Holy Ghost, offered to man, of His interference on their behalf, constitutes the sin of which especially it is said that there cannot be forgiveness.

Let us suppose for a moment that the internal evidence was that which is intended to produce conviction. A teacher of morality who had great powers of persuasion, and whose life corresponded to his doctrine, would no doubt have considerable success so long as that doctrine involved no novelty; and by adapting his teaching to the different classes which might come within his reach, he might gain many of all ranks to listen to him and receive him. But he must not bring forward any new doctrine; his message must not

clash with the received religious convictions of his hearers ; he must only urge upon them the witness which they already have, with greater power and energy. Repentance and reformation may certainly be promoted by a proclamation of their necessity, and a skilful dissection of the false excuses which men make to themselves for neglect of duty.

Such was the case with John the Baptist, who without miraculous power attracted Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about to hear him ; and they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Pharisees and Sadducees, publicans and soldiers, the most unlikely of mankind to be moved to repentance and self-condemnation, were all under the influence of the preacher in the wilderness :—but John proclaimed no new doctrine. His light was the last bright lamp that shone on the letters of the elder covenant. He took up the last warnings of Malachi his predecessor, and no prejudices had to be combated. He preached to them what they acknowledged already, although they disobeyed it. He only prepared a highway for one mightier than himself, and was to wane and to decrease, as the Lamb of God came forth with the announcement of glad tidings, and salvation through the new and living way consecrated by Himself. John was a burning and a shining light, and they who hesitated to receive Christ were willing for a season to rejoice in his light ; but Christ came Himself, ‘ that they

might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly' (S. John x. 10). John the Baptist did not proclaim that the time was coming when men should not be bound to worship at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth. It was this that shocked the hearers; they could not listen with patience to one who came to proclaim the fulfilment of their law, and its consequent displacement for the establishment of a new polity extending to all mankind. We cannot help noticing the very different effect which must have been produced upon the people by such announcements as these: 'Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time—but I say unto you.' A people jealous of their religion and exclusive privileges would now be shocked; and what could reassure them, but some evident token of the Divine support to the messenger, who, while he brought such strange doctrines, yet appealed to the Jewish Scriptures, as testifying of Himself? If Christ had merely been a preacher of morality, enforcing lessons which have their germ in every man's heart, and had had no great doctrines of sublime and mysterious import to declare, the example of John the Baptist shews that he would have met with a more favourable reception; but his *new* announcements moved them with indignation, zeal, and vehement opposition. 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.' How could such pretensions, again we say it, be maintained, but by a present

evident exercise of Divine power, to shew that God had set his seal to the testimony delivered, strange, incomprehensible, bewildering though it were ?

Though the pure morality of the Christian doctrine might weigh with some, as we have already observed, yet this could not be the case with the multitude ; for such evidence can only be appreciated by those who are thoughtful ; and the personal character of Christ, supremely influential as it undoubtedly is in confirming the faith of *Christians*, could at first only have influenced those who were our Lord's intimate friends and adherents.

If the evidence had been confined to these points, the majority of mankind would have been left alone, and never have been reclaimed from the congregation of the dead, after they had wandered out of the way of understanding.

And there is another remark we think worthy of notice ; that those who contend for the validity and necessity of miraculous evidence in the first instance, do not insist upon its necessity for producing general conviction at the present day among our own people ; although, as we think, they *do* justly plead for the necessity of there being a faithful record of such interposition in time of old. It is argued that such testimony was necessary at the time, and under the circumstances of the hearers when the Gospel was preached ; but now in all civilized countries the establishment of Christianity, and its general prevalence, secure it a hearing

already. It is not therefore necessary that the first arresting of the attention should be secured in any strange, new and startling way. If new sects arise in our day we do not care even to give a hearing to their preachers or heralds ; but if these people pretended to miraculous power, exercised constantly in the face of their opponents, we should feel that there must be something demanding of rational men investigation and attention. This is the case with which we ought to compare the first rise of Christianity ; and we see how large a difference there is between it and the case as we are familiar with it. If, as now, Christianity gains the attention of the multitude from many other circumstances besides its pretensions to the support of miraculous powers, this should not induce us to think that internal proofs are all-sufficient without the gifts of the Holy Ghost in wonders and signs. All we can conclude is, that the effect already produced on the world by the success and spread of the Gospel, is sufficient to convince the multitude that Divine power produced and promoted that success and universality.

In what has been said an attempt has been made to set aside the prejudice raised against miraculous evidence, by exalting the internal evidence of Christianity, and to state clearly the separate and joint influence of each.

In conclusion, for the application of the warning of the unpardonable sin to the Church in our days, we have only to notice that those who

reject the supernatural evidence which has been given by the Holy Ghost for the establishment of the Faith, generally do so, because they reject the supernatural doctrines which Christianity teaches. Viewing Christianity as a system of exalted morality only, which might have been taught by any highly gifted man, and refusing to recognize in it 'Mysteries of Faith,' such as the atonement and sacramental grace, they consistently enough persuade themselves that there was no need of any supernatural external signs to aid the promotion of a sublime philosophy—a republished Natural Religion. Arguing of Christianity as *one* of God's many ways with men, and not as **THE** way, **THE** system, **THE** great end of the existence of mankind, they are averse to admit that there is in its essence or in its credentials anything which stamps it with these characteristics of singularity. The depths and heights of God's counsels declared to man in the Gospel of Jesus Christ they explain away into vague generalities or enthusiastic expressions. They level the everlasting hills, extract all their profundity from the deep things of God, and then cannot admit any necessity for His interference with the laws of nature—for his permission of discontinuity in the chain connecting effects with their ordinary causes. If the Pharisees attributed the works of the Holy Ghost to the Spirit of Evil, the men of whom we speak destroy the evidence of these works by denying their existence, or falsifying their character ; they

charge the Word of God, in which these things are recorded for us by men inspired by the Holy Ghost, with error and untruth; and so this becomes a sin against the Holy Ghost of much the same kind. It is attributing the work of the Holy Ghost to the Father of lies. If the credit of the Scriptures is assailed, in order to get rid of the difficulties of miracle and prophecy, it seems that this is done in the same spirit of determined opposition and unbelief which the Pharisees exhibited. *They* rejected the proofs which our Lord gave of His divine authority, and charged Him with being in league with God's enemy; and now those who reject the same proofs, the record of which is secured to us by the same Spirit, asserting that these records are untrustworthy—deceitful—are surely sinners in the same sense.

Let it not be said that as they admit the practical parts of the system, therefore they are not to be judged so harshly. Did not the Pharisees admit the Divine Laws of morality? Did they not do battle, as they pretended, for the honour of God, understood in their own sense? Did they not recognize Natural Religion? Did they not profess a zeal for God? 'Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner.' Though men may now be very zealous for the laws of natural morality; yet if they reject the peculiar doctrines of Christianity because they are abnormal, and the peculiar proofs of those doctrines because they are miraculous, what right have we to say that

their sin is venial, or to assume that a man's faith in these things is non-essential?

God's Word is a light unto our path, and a lantern unto our feet. Its doctrines, on which acts of faith are dependent, wonderful and mysterious—high as heaven, deep as ocean—are the very sinews and marrow of the whole system. And to deprive Religion of these, is to tear away its flesh and substance, and present us with a skeleton instead of life. I should therefore fear when I read the words of our Lord's denunciation on the Pharisees, "Whosoever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him," that if we dare to diminish in any way the wonderful works of the Holy Ghost, which as miracles and gifts were wrought in confirmation of the Faith; if in any degree we slight their testimony, and teach men so, we may now incur the same awful penalty; because the sin of the Pharisees consisted in rejection of the wonderful works which the Spirit wrought, and in refusing to acknowledge them as God's.

From such contempt of thy Word and Commandment, good Lord, deliver us for Jesus Christ's sake. *Amen.*

LECTURE VII.

HEBREWS II. 10.

It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

THERE are many portions of Holy Scripture which speak of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, as a consequence of his humiliation and suffering, such as, 'He became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross; therefore God also hath highly exalted him.' This is generally explained of Christ's human nature, since in His divine nature he could not receive exaltation; and as connected with the great object of Christ's mission, the regeneration and restoration of human nature to the highest place in God's favour, this doctrine is generally intelligible, and received by the majority of Christendom. There remains however some difficulty in those texts which speak of Christ *being made* perfect by suffering, because, as He was without sin, as man, it may be asked in what does this *making* perfect consist? 'He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth,' saith S. Peter (i. 2, 22), according to the prophecy of Isaiah (liiii. 9). He himself affirmed that He did always that which

was pleasing to the Father (John viii. 29), and he challenged his opponents to convince Him of sin (S. John viii. 46). S. Paul affirms of him that He knew no sin (2 Cor. v. 21), and that though in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin (Heb. iv. 15). It may then be asked, how can one already perfect be said to *be made* perfect through suffering, as though he had imperfection? Thus in the text it is said, 'It was fitting that the Captain of our salvation should be made perfect through suffering;' and again, 'Though he was a Son (*υιὸς ᾧου*), yet learned He obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect He became the Author of salvation unto all them that obey him.'

The answer to this enquiry must be made from a consideration of the use of the word 'to make perfect.' In one sense it imports progress towards a higher state, in another, the completion of a particular character or office to be fulfilled¹. In

¹ There is no doubt that the LXX. use of the word *τελειόω* is *consecrare*, and Mede has argued strongly for that sense in this passage; but as this sense cannot be universally assigned to the word in the New Testament, I have preferred adhering to the more general signification. *Erasmus, Schmid, Beza, Schoetjen*, take it in the same sense as *Mede*. Scilicet, says *Wolfius, Curæ Philolog.* Vol. iv. p. 621, Sacerdotes Veteris Testamenti per mortem et victimas animalium, Christus vero per mortem et victimam sui corporis inauguratus est. Interim cum Christus etiam ante mortem sacerdotio illo functus sit pro hominibus, variis perpeccionibus exantlatis, adeoque huic officio inauguratus censeri debeat, non video quomodo inauguratio illa simpliciter ad mortem ejus referri possit, imprimis cum vita functus, sacerdotio suo in tantum per-

the first sense it is used by S. Paul speaking of himself, 'not as though I were already perfect,' and S. John speaks of our love being made perfect. In the second sense it is used by our Lord speaking of himself: 'Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.' And the author of the

functus sit. Itaque perstiterim fere in significato consummandi vel perficiendi de quo conferes Jacobi Lydii Agonistica Sacra, p. 129.

The subsequent ecclesiastical use of the word is according to *Suicer*,

1. de Baptismo, Gregory Nazianz. Orat. xxxvii. p. 596. S. Athanas. Orat. ii. contra Arianos, Tom. i. p. 341. He adds, Cur vero τελειοῦσθαι sit baptizari intelligitur ex Dialogo i. Athanasii contra Macedonium, Tom. ii. p. 265, ubi hæc leguntur: πῶς οὐχ ὁμολογούμενον ἔστιν, ὅτι τῆς προσκυνήσεως τὸ βάπτισμα μείζον, ὅπουγε καὶ κατηχούμενοι προσκυνοῦσι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν, οὐκ ἔχουσι δὲ τελειότητα, εἰ μὴ βαπτισθῶσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· εἰ δὲ μὴ εἰσι τέλειοι χριστιανοὶ οἱ κατηχούμενοι πρὶν ἢ βαπτισθῶσι, βαπτισθέντες δὲ τελειοῦνται, τὸ βάπτισμα ἄρα μείζον ἔστι τῆς προσκυνήσεως; ὁ τὴν τελειότητα παρέχει. Qui ergo baptizantur dicuntur τελειοῦσθαι consecrari, quia Deo consecrantur et quasi inaugurantur; quemadmodum qui ad sacra promoventur officia dicuntur τελειοῦσθαι. Anonymus in Vita Athanasii in appendice, Tom. ii. Hunc nempe Evagrium qui fuit successor Eudoxii Ariani in sede Antiochena, sed orthodoxus: ἱεραὶ χεῖρες ἐτελείωσαν Εὐσταθίου, ἀνδρὸς ἐπιφανοῦς.

2. De morte (1) piorum, frequently in the *Menologium*; also *S. Chrysost.* Hom. xiv. 1 Tim. p. 309. (2) in specie de morte martyrum. *S. Chrysost.* Hom. xxxiv. in Act. Apost. of S. Paul, ἐπὶ Νέρωνος ἐτελειώθη, in reference to his own saying, 'I have finished my course.' (Acts xx. 24.) In 2 Tim. iv. 7, it is τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα. It is a constant expression in the *Menologium* for the death of the martyrs, τελειοῦται.

As applied to our Lord, the word τέλειος became in later times a word of peculiar and technical kind in consequence of the Arian controversy. See notes to *S. Athanasius' Treatises against Arianism*, Part i. p. 108, p. 116.

Epistle to the Hebrews affirms that the completeness of the state of those who in time of old died in faith, depended on the full development of God's purpose towards men as displayed in the Christian Church (Heb. xi. 40); and the spirits of just men are made perfect in this sense, that their complete emancipation from death is effected by the work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In both senses may we explain the application of the words 'made perfect' to our Saviour; for in the first place, Christ took our nature upon Him with its infirmities¹, though not with its taint of corruption; and His being made perfect, as far as this is concerned, imports His triumphing over that infirmity; through suffering He was made perfect, in order that weakness might no longer be the necessary burden of the redeemed. And in the second place, this process secures the *completeness* of the work of Redemption; 'in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.' His contest with the evil one was only to be carried on through the weakness which the nature He took had essentially in itself. As He was incapable of sinning, the tempter could only attack Him through the infirmities of His human nature, and by vanquishing the enemy on this ground, the perfection or com-

¹ See *S. Chrysost. on John*, Hom. LXVII. 1, 2; *S. Cyril. de Rect. Fid.* p. 18; *S. Ambros. de Fid.* II. n. 56; *S. Cyril. Ep. ad Success.* I. p. 138, quoted in different places of the Athanasian Treatises as above.

pleteness of His work was secured¹. The sense of want, the endurance of temptation and of the withdrawal of God's face, and death, had all to be undergone in order to lift mankind from the fallen state, as well as in order that hereafter He might be one with all His faithful members in like trials. If it had pleased God to restore all mankind at once to the state of innocence after the atonement had been completed, abolishing sin, and all possibility of sinning, then the being made perfect in one sense only would have stood; but since it has pleased Him that mankind shall render a rational obedience, and by faith in Christ be brought through trial in this life, the other is also necessary in order that the work of Christ may be effectually wrought in each individual soul that is finally saved.

Thus through Christ's suffering the redemption of human nature is completed, and through His sufferings he is united to each individual Christian in his trials; and so the salvation of each one of those who attain to eternal life is completed. This seems to be entirely in accordance with the general argument of the Apostle in the place we are considering: 'We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour—that He by the grace of God should taste of death for every man. For it became Him, for whom are all

¹ See *S. Athanasius' Treatises against the Arians*, (Eng. Transl.) p. 241, note h.

things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings....Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He likewise Himself took part of the same, that He might through death destroy him that had the power of death, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.'

Christ therefore took upon Him the infirmities of flesh and blood, and doing battle to the prince of darkness on this battle-ground, overcame him and set mankind free. It was through death that death was destroyed. It is through the imperfections which are involved in the idea of liability to suffering, that Christ completed His work. This idea I wish to follow out now, as verified in Christ's body, the Church, ever since it has existed; and I would argue from the way in which the infirmities to which the Church is liable, have proved sources of strength and contributed to her advancement, that she must evidently have been preserved by a divine power. Just as Christ, the head of the body, through participation in the infirmities of our nature, relaxed and unfastened the hold which Satan had upon it; so, as S. Paul wrote to the Philippians (i. 12), the disastrous things which happened unto him, fell out rather for the furtherance of the gospel. And in all subsequent times the infirmities of the Church have, by God's wonderful providence, been turned into

sources of strength, and caused the spread of the true faith.

Before proceeding to this development of the doctrine taught us respecting our Saviour, we may notice one or two occasions where the perfection of the members of Christ through imitation of the Saviour is referred to. And in the first place, we may refer to the saying in our Lord's discourse (S. Luke vi. 40), 'The disciple is not above his master; but every one that is perfect shall be as his master.' The word translated 'perfect' here is not *τελειωθείς*, but *κατηρτισμένος*, and the connexion with the preceding verses will be as follows: 'Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master.' Being addressed to the disciples, this is a warning to them that to secure a faithful discharge of duty in those who teach others, the teachers must themselves first of all become enlightened, but must not assume the office of judging other men individually; which was an office which Christ himself never assumed while exercising his ministry. 'I judge no man' (S. John viii. 15). In this respect all Christ's ministers must follow the example of their Master, not set themselves above Him; and every one must be fully prepared or instructed in the same way that He was; they must be prepared for their office as He was, i. e. by humility. They must declare God's judgments in general terms. 'Hath no man condemned thee? neither do I condemn thee;' but nevertheless hear the word

which condemns all sin, and 'go, and sin no more.' And they must be perfected for their office as He was, through suffering, as S. Epiphanius interprets it, and as our Lord Himself on another occasion warns them: 'If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you.' This humility and diffidence in judging was to be promoted in them by remembering that they must expect an evil construction on their motives, and therefore not repine under it, but expect to be perfected in one (S. John xvii. 23) by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, to sustain them under their persecutions, knowing that they must take their share with the Captain of their salvation.

Again, this perfection through infirmity is affirmed (in 2 Cor. xii. 9), when the Lord revealed to S. Paul that it was in weakness that his Master's strength was to be made perfect. Thus, as Christ was made perfect through suffering, so was the Apostle to endure gladly all the afflictions which came upon him, because in these very things he was to be made perfect, or completed, through the strength of Christ imparted to him.

In passing on to the general subject marked out, we notice that the death of Christ was of such a nature that, humanly speaking, it should have been fatal to his design. If the founder of a Religion suffers death as a malefactor, an ignominious death, with all attendant circumstances of disgrace, this would, generally speaking, suffice to defeat all pretensions to any heaven-sent

mission. 'What,' would it be said, by one who heard of such an event, 'can you put faith in one who was condemned and executed as a criminal by an obscure Roman governor, in a small province of the Empire, one of an obstinate and turbulent race? Is not this wretched end of one who had such lofty pretensions enough to convince you that you must be under a mistake?'

Yet how strangely different was the result! Leaving out of all question at present the high mystery involved in Christ's death as a sacrifice, we see that this very fact of Christ's ignominious death was in after ages a most powerful inducement to the early Christians in time of persecution to seal their testimony by their blood; and if the blood of the martyrs be the seed of Christianity, we see how the death of our Saviour promoted their willing sacrifice of life in the same way, how it produced in them that lowliness and humility which He preached.

But still more, through death Christ subdued the power of death, not only by inspiring His followers with contempt for its pain and courage under its infliction; but leading the way to His Resurrection, it prepared the greatest proof that we can bring of the divinity of His errand to mankind. His death was the necessary preliminary to His resurrection; and His proving to His disciples that He had thus vanquished the great enemy of mankind by laying down His life, and then by His own power resuming it, inspired them with the

utmost confidence and hope. 'If Christ be not risen, we are of all men most miserable;' 'but now *is* Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.'

Here we have the first most remarkable instance of Christ being made perfect through suffering. The completion of our redemption was in His submission to this the great and principal infirmity to which mankind is subject, and the overcoming the fear of death in all Christians, in consequence of death being subject to Him, is another result in which through weakness He is made our strength. If all mankind were subject to bondage through fear of death, Christ's death was to abolish this fear, and to prove (when it led to His resurrection) to all the faithful that Christ had destroyed death as an irreversible sentence. The charnel-house was no longer to be a perpetual cheerless prison. It was to be the threshold of eternal life to all who would obey the Gospel.

In this then we have an instance of the perfection and completion of the scheme of redemption through infirmity. The resurrection, the consequence of Christ's death, was the chief ground of the confidence which the disciples had. It sent them out to preach with unwavering assiduity, the message He had left for mankind. When a result so unexpected ensues upon a catastrophe seemingly so fatal, is not this an evidence of overruling by a divine will, an argument that Christianity is from God?

Next consider that in a few years after Christ's death, when considerable progress had been made in converting the people to the new doctrines, the rulers of the Jews, unable to despise or overlook the changes that threatened them, united against the principal teachers, destroyed the chief of the Apostles, broke up the whole society, and scattered them away from Jerusalem. What follows? Did this check the spread of the new doctrine? Did it put down the innovation, and stop the proselytizing which had gone on? Quite the contrary. The scattering of the early disciples from their head quarters, and the dispersion of the organization which they had made, produced nothing but enlarged success. They went preaching everywhere, and gaining multitudes over to their side, and soon, the narrow boundaries of Jewish nationality being broken down, the heathen and surrounding nations were persuaded to enrol themselves in the new faith.

Persecution, contempt, the sword, exile, all tended to the furtherance of the mighty scheme. The things that were meant for its destruction, turned out for its advantage and corroboration; and thus we see the completeness of the body of Christ promoted and worked out through infirmity and sufferings.

As we pass on to later times, we notice the constant persecutions of the Christians under successive Roman Emperors. These were sufficient to have broken down the strongest hearts. All

that malice and ingenuity could devise was employed to shake the resolution of the Christian converts. The rage and insolence of a brutal populace, the scourges and torture of legal barbarity, subtle promises and entreaties employed to induce compliance with idolatrous rites, were in their turn arrayed against them. They were accused of the most odious crimes, they were made the scapegoats of the most infamous wickedness on the part of others; they were held up to execration as the cause of the public calamities. Vast numbers were put to death throughout the Empire. Fresh modes of torture were invented to terrify them: where public authority was wanting, popular fury in many places overwhelmed them: not only pagans, but Jewish impostors¹ were against them. In spite of the more equitable decrees of Trajan and Antoninus Pius, public frenzy prevailed: the calumnies of philosophers, even under the mild rule of Marcus Aurelius, procured them injurious treatment. The rapacity and cowardice of a cruel covetous magistracy, submitting to the voice of the populace, was the source of much suffering to them. When thus the most dreadful penalties were incurred for adherence to the new religion, what was the consequence? Did these sufferings avail to check the spread of the Gospel? Far from it. The Church grew and prospered, and daily its num-

¹ Barchochebas. *Justin Martyr*, Apol. i. 31; *Euseb. H. E.* Lib. iv. 8; *Basnage, Histoire des Juifs*, Lib. vii. c. 12.

bers increased and multiplied¹. The noble example of the martyrs became arguments wherewith the preachers and apologists for Christianity assaulted the strong holds of their opponents. The things which were wrought for its destruction turned out in every place for the furtherance of the Gospel; though constancy to their vows never failed to procure exquisite torture to the professors of religion, the weakness of women was turned into the most heroic courage. The flames of the stake became beacons of light to draw men to admire, examine and embrace the truth. The heroism which endurance of cruelty called forth became an inducement to many to believe. They could not resist the evidence which such constancy afforded, of high hopes in the condemned. Sincerity, shewn by *so many*, could not but awaken in thoughtful minds desire to know the grounds of such confidence, and thus through suffering again was the Church made perfect.

So remarkable was the result of these persecutions in promoting instead of stopping the spread of Christianity, that it has now become an argument with men for refraining from persecutions, because they had so illustrious an example of the growth of the Church, while all was done to prevent it. It was found that the effect produced was exactly the contrary of that which was

¹ Fundendo sanguinem et patiendo magis quam faciendo contumelias, Christi fundata est Ecclesia.—*Hieronimi Epistolæ*, quoted by Dr Barrow, Vol. I. p. 124 (fol. ed.)

anticipated, and that there was in Christianity a power of vitality which only shewed itself the more, as the attempts to destroy it were the more vehement.

This demands a little further notice. The remark now commonly made, and assented to, that as a general rule, persecution of opinions rather promotes their spread than impedes it, may admit of very considerable question. The Albigenses were effectually extinguished by the blood-thirsty cruelty of Arnold the Abbot of Cîteaux, and Simon de Montfort. The Hugonots were extirpated from nearly the whole of France by the horrible persecutions which followed the repeal of protecting laws. Mahometan conquest has obliterated the ancient sees of northern Africa, and a country once fertile in most active and intelligent Christian writers, is now utterly without the light of the Gospel.

It ought not then to be assumed too hastily, that the vigorous flourishing of the Christian Church, whilst assailed by the bitter animosities of human persecutors, was the result of a natural law which makes opposition a source of strength, and ensures the success of whatever is oppressed. I think it is a more true account of this general persuasion, that it has arisen out of the very circumstances to which we are referring. Uninfluenced by this historical fact, the prevalent opinion of mankind is the exact opposite. Practically, persecution is never considered as promoting

the interest of the party which is persecuted, and it is unreasonable to assume a natural tendency of things, as the solution of the fact that Christianity grew vigorously under the opposition of heathen powers, in order to defeat a conclusion that may more rationally be drawn, that Christianity had a *Divine* special support. Gamaliel, who opposed persecution, did not do so because it would be sure to defeat its own object, but because it was uncertain whether the new religion were from God or not, and because so many seditious movements came to nothing of themselves. All men naturally are persecutors of those who entertain opinions opposite to their own, and this must arise in a great degree from an impression that what is obnoxious can be stopped or defeated by oppression.

I am not therefore prepared to assign the continued and substantial progress of Christianity under the Imperial persecutions to this law of contraries. It seems much more according to right reason, to believe that when the religion of self-denial and purity made its way through blood and fiery tortures, against the greatest power that the world has ever seen of a temporal kind, it was because the Almighty Father protected it and promoted it; and because it was under this special protection, therefore it grew and increased while all things seem to portend the contrary. *As for this sect, we hear it everywhere spoken against,* was the ordinary feeling. It could not

have survived this general mistrust and dislike, when they were supported by the terrors of the executioner, if it had not pleased God that it should go on, increase and multiply and subdue the earth, and so, in the midst of sufferings, progress towards perfection and completion.

Thus as the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through sufferings, so the body, of which He is the Head, grew, increased, and multiplied through sufferings also, and evinced its divine energy by turning into means of progress what was meant for its annihilation.

The fortunes of the nascent spiritual kingdom were again severely tried by internal dissensions. The plague of Arianism had well-nigh prevailed at one time. The tares, which the enemy had sown among the wheat, almost overcame the good seed. At the council of Ariminum (359), a decree was passed which seemed to accommodate matters between the contending parties; but it was soon found that through the subtlety of the Arian party, it had in reality admitted the error which was opposed. The true doctrine of the Church was obscured, and the poison had spread to such a degree that the four hundred bishops of that council were either intimidated or deceived into the conclusion they adopted¹. Never was the faith in greater danger. Yet out of this peril was the

¹ *S. Athanasius, Epistle concerning the Councils at Ariminum and Seleucia*, c. II. § 30. See the note there, in the English translation, 'Library of the Fathers.'

Church delivered; and roused by the energy of S. Hilary in the west, the sanction given to error was recalled, and the true doctrine re-established in authority. Now it seems undoubted that out of this peril arose ultimately considerable advantages. The condemnation of the Macedonians, Nestorians, Monophysites, and other heretics must have been the more easy task, in consequence of the rigid investigations which had taken place during the Arian controversy. The final triumph of the orthodox doctrine in the former case, must have led men to place greater trust in the clearness and distinctions which were now able to be made. They were prepared for investigations which would soon put down errors: and according to the saying of S. Paul, that there must needs be heresies, that the faithful may be made manifest, so clearness and precision were attained by the Church being generally bound to certain close and accurate conclusions.

Sufferings again produced progress towards perfection. Purged that it might bring forth more fruit, the Church came forth from the trial invigorated and ready to do battle to the powers of evil in other forms. Schism and dissension, the rending of the body, the deep and grievous wounds which the prince of darkness could inflict upon the spouse of Christ, like the sufferings of our blessed Redeemer Himself, all resulted in the healing of the nations; all promoted the extension of the covenant among the sons of men.

Further, the irruption of the savage hordes of barbarians which caused the destruction of the Roman Empire in the West was another danger which threatened and severely tried the Church of Christ. The enervated and unwarlike population which now formed the mass of the Empire could oppose no effectual resistance to the invaders; and carnage and destruction prevailed throughout its boundaries. But to countervail the efforts of the ungodly, the kingdom of Christ had arms mightier than the sword and the bow. The conquerors of the land were themselves brought under its sway, and were enrolled in the number of the faithful. The nations which mowed down the Imperial ranks, and crushed the decaying remnants of the power of the Cesars, were converted to the faith of Christ, and new subjects were thus added to the kingdom which was really to become universal and permanent. And though out of this very success a new danger arose; though many of the invaders were converted to heretical forms of Christianity, as were the Vandals in Africa, who embraced the Arian heresy; yet on the whole, and by degrees, the cloud which had overspread the brightness of the Christian truth was gradually dispersed, and the faith made a gain of that which brought ruin to the human Empire under which it had hitherto been propagated.

The protecting hand of God was again clearly seen in the final condemnation of the Eutychians

in the sixth Œcumenical Synod (680). This heresy, like the Arian, threatened to overwhelm the Church, when the Emperor Heraclius made his decree in its favour, and Honorius, the bishop of Rome, concurred in the surrender of the truth, for an apparent reunion of the orthodox and the heretics. Betrayed by one who ought to have been its staunch defender, and harassed by the extension of the power of the State to the maintenance of false principles, the Church was well-nigh borne down with misfortune. But out of the bitter came forth the strong, and through the courageous resistance to error, backed by power, and connived at by Ecclesiastical authorities, which was conducted by Sophronius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and others of the faithful, the Church was delivered from this peril, and out of weakness was made strong. Was there not some special favour towards her, when under circumstances so trying, and against influence so potent, the true faith was preserved and the struggling Church was saved? And is there not here a fulfilment of the general characteristic, which we have noticed, so that, through suffering, the Church grew, and achieved independence of the edicts of Emperors, and superiority over the fatal compromises of time-serving Prelates?

Again, in the midst of safety there is danger. The consideration and influence acquired by the Church led to a tyranny and organization, which, while it had its use, as we shall see, yet was in a

spiritual sense most disastrous. The authority of the Roman See, though encroaching, was at first exercised for good. It was natural so long as Rome was the seat of power, that its bishop should be looked upon as the chief protector of the Church. He was better able than other bishops to resist all encroachments, and to assist in the reformation of abuses either of doctrine or discipline, which in the disordered state of Christendom, during the invasions of the barbarians, spread throughout its length and breadth. The enforcing of submission to the See of Rome, as the head quarters of the Western Church, was a natural consequence of such a state of things; and detrimental as it was in aftertimes to the purity of the Gospel, yet at first it might seem to be almost necessary to preserve order and uniformity of doctrine.

We may in the following manner discern how this infliction on the Church of Christ was turned into an instrument of good. In the dark ages, amid universal ignorance and neglect of learning even by those who had time and means at their disposal, the preservation of the faith must have been much assisted by the respect which the political influence of the bishops of Rome secured to Christianity, the promotion of Christian societies, and the immunity gained for religious foundations. The perpetual state of warfare between rival princes, the feebleness of the governments, the insolence of independent powerful

subjects, caused general lawlessness and disorder. Ecclesiastical revenues were constantly in danger of seizure by kings and feudal lords, improper persons were often thrust into places of trust and honour, churches and monasteries were often pillaged and burned, the schools of learning were extinguished, the laity were immersed in gross ignorance, and the clergy were not much superior to them. The unlawful attitude assumed by the bishops of Rome was, under these circumstances, one which God overruled for the good of the Church. The influence which they sought for worldly ends, was of use to preserve the remnant that was left, and the consciousness of this protection produced good fruit. Though the main body of Christians was at this time little careful to obey the law of Christ, yet there were many who shewed forth most ardent and earnest religion, who devoted themselves most unreservedly to the practice of piety and self-denial. Amidst much ignorance and superstition, there was much of charity, much zeal, many good works. There was an earnest spirit of devotion in those who gave their whole energies to the work of missions, in the numbers who retired from the strife and honours of the world to spend their days in penitence and prayer. This was much promoted by the security and sanctity of religious houses, and the respect which generally attached to the profession of religious vows, and both these were in large measure owing to the power and authority of the Pope.

Thus the preservation of religion was ensured by an encroachment which threatened eventually very great evils. What was really an injury and usurpation, led to a result for which we may well even now thank God. The loss of the Church in this case was turned into gain, and the furtherance of the Gospel resulted from the bonds weaved tightly around her: at first they strengthened, though afterwards they threatened to crush.

Following still the fortunes of the kingdom of Christ, we deplore the prevalence of error in doctrine which gradually crept into it; but the flagrant abuses which awakened men's indignation produced the Reformation of religion, which restored the purity of the Gospel, and set men free from the iron tyranny of Rome, which had become unendurable. It was no doubt attended with many evils. The interruption of communion between churches which ensued, when many resolved upon returning to the purity of the faith and simplicity of ritual which characterized the Apostolic ages, was in itself a great loss. Since by unity and mutual love Christ's kingdom was to be known among men, whatever marred this testimony to the world was a loss and suffering to the Church. Bitter railings and accusations, mutual persecutions and destructive wars, all followed upon this disruption; and what was the result? Did the world at large begin to argue, as it might be feared they would, that so divided and disunited a body as the Church then was,

could not be the kingdom of peace and good will, and that our Saviour's mission had failed, and the gates of hell had prevailed against the Church, in direct negation of what Christ himself had prophesied? We know that the result was quite the reverse, that since the time when the national churches of the Teutonic races declared themselves free from any obligation to the doctrinal decisions of the Church of Rome, and would no longer submit to papal decrees, piety and charity and good works of every description have more abounded amongst them. Civilization received a marked impulse from that time, and the reformed churches have been the pioneers in all the improvements which have since taken place for the general benefit of mankind. It is beyond my purpose to trace whether the Reformation of religion proceeded from the revival of learning, and the greater facility acquired in consequence for investigating the Inspired records, and the history and doctrine of the primitive Church. It is sufficient to indicate, that from a period of great suffering, by the want of purity in doctrine, by ignorance and scandalous abuses, when, even on the confession of the rigid adherents of the papal system¹, there was a most urgent need of reformation, out of all this arose a state of things tending to the increase of true piety and rational obedience to the spiritual laws of Christianity. It

¹ See the *Decreta et Constitutiones Concilii Tridentini*, passim, and *Sarpi*, B. I.

seems apparent to most understandings, that the papal pretensions could never have continued under the present state of the world, since even in countries still adhering to the bishop of Rome's communion, the power which he exercises has shrunk most considerably from its former arrogant extent. Popes are no longer of any consequence in the political system of Europe; their decrees are disregarded, their temporal authority a mere shadow, the voice which they once had in the destinies of empires is completely silenced. So great a change from the vast pretensions which they set up before the Reformation, must in a considerable degree have resulted from it; and it is difficult to see how so monstrous an evil as the perpetual interference of a power, combining spiritual and temporal authority, in the internal concerns of nearly every nation in Europe, could have been gotten rid of, unless there had been some extraordinary revolution in the whole system. Great good must be purchased by sacrifices; but in this case the sacrifices were immaterial compared with the result attained. The progress of mankind, intellectually and socially, required the overthrow of the spiritual despotism, and this resulted in great measure from the alliance of the despotism with false doctrine, superstitions, and a variety of abuses. It was these latter which aroused the spirits of men to shake off their fetters, and return to the simple faith of the early Church. It was not an

object of the reformers at first to get rid of the supremacy of Rome. Their first aim was a purification of the defiled Temple of God, and it was only in the course of events, so ordered by the far-reaching care of the Almighty, that this purification involved the downfall of papal tyranny in a large part of the western Church, and its gradual shrinking up into much smaller dimensions in that part which still acknowledges the spiritual headship of the Pope.

The sufferings of the Church, the throes and heavings attendant on the struggle, the pains endured by the whole body resulted in deliverance from an iron yoke; the greater expansion and freedom of thought which followed, the clearer perception of the great vital power of the Gospel over men's hearts, the larger and more philosophical adaptation of the system to the wants of the human race, have all resulted from the strife which accompanied this great change; and thus we are again brought to confess that as the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings, His body also is subject to the same law, and exemplifies still the permanence of the type,—completeness and progress through suffering and chastisement.

If from the time of the Reformation we fix our attention on our own branch of the Church, we shall see much of the same law prevailing. The Erastianism of the age when the princes of the house of Tudor held sway over the land was

severely punished by the subsequent persecution which Puritan bitterness stirred up; and the temporary cloud which overspread the Church at the time of the civil wars, and during the triumph of the republican party, though it seemed to threaten the annihilation of our ecclesiastical polity, was not without advantage to the spiritual wellbeing of the Church. At no time can she reckon so large a number of sound and learned theologians as during the 17th century. As the downfall of the Stuarts drew near, the prelates of the Church were among the foremost defenders of civil liberty, the most courageous opponents of the illegal measures of the court; and this was not from any joining in unchristian opposition to the powers that be, from factious or unworthy motives, but, as was shewn soon after, there was a rigid and stern sense of duty which prompted those who had stood up as witnesses for the truth against the prerogative, to sacrifice *all* for Christ's sake—a noble conscientiousness which even those who cannot sympathize with their scruples, will always recognize: the illustrious name of KEN will ever command the affection and respect of all true churchmen. How different was this spirit from that unfortunate reliance on secular support which characterized the early part of the century! We cannot but observe how adversity had been a school of discipline, and how through much suffering the Church had gained in highminded tone, in regard for the rights of conscience, and

in knowledge of its independent authority and dignity. We cannot fail to see how this was brought about through suffering; how cruel persecution and oppression had wrought for the spiritual wellbeing and perfecting of the body of Christ amongst us.

But I refrain from urging this in later times, as it might involve discussion of points too nearly touching present difficulties; and I hasten to conclude, merely noticing one feature of our times which seems to me to exhibit much the same general characteristic, that the evils and damage resulting from the infirmity of men, are overruled by God for the welfare and promotion of the Gospel.

That unity of doctrine and mutual communion are sadly interrupted, is undoubted: we have many sects in the land, producing mutual jealousies, much theological disputation, acrimonious altercations, and uncharitable dissension. But there is one result of this separation which indicates God's hand. The most vigorous efforts of our chief dissenting bodies are not directed to proselytizing at home. Missions to the heathen and the conversion of the nations to the faith of Christ have been the objects to which they have devoted most of their alms. The efforts made to evangelize the unconverted nations of the earth have multiplied exceedingly, along with the rise of separate bodies amongst us. The energies of those zealous men whose unfortunate prejudices

prevent them from remaining in communion with the Church, have been directed to this object of Christianizing heathen lands, and the sums raised and expended on this important object are surely far larger than they would have been, had we remained a united Church without schism at our doors. I do not wish to be understood as maintaining that all that is done, is well done; but Christ is preached, and using the words of S. Paul, 'Though some preach Christ of envy and strife, and some of good will, notwithstanding every way CHRIST is preached, and therein I do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.' I cannot but think that our sins have been turned by God to the furtherance of the Gospel, and that which is in itself a calamity, has by divine supervision and through the divine counsels, resulted in the greater abundance of exertion for carrying the news of salvation into the dark regions of paganism. I might also notice instances in which the neglected inhabitants of our own land, have by this same agency been rescued from ignorance of the fundamental truths of the Gospel; how irregular and unauthorized ministrations have yet been a great blessing to some whom our lack of service would have left to perish in ignorance and vice, and how these have reacted upon the Church to stir up her members to greater diligence and zeal. And though we may be keenly sensible of the difficulties which these things create, yet we ought not to overlook the fact that there has been some of

the Lord's work done, where we omitted to supply the means.

In all these instances I see again that the misfortunes, the neglect, the errors of the Church which in reality were losses and sufferings in a spiritual sense, have yet been by an Almighty hand, overruled for good. The promotion of God's kingdom in the hearts of men is not frustrated by our supineness and want of energy; our sins shall bring us into dangers and difficulties, but these afflictions eventually result in the furtherance of the Gospel. God's holy name is proclaimed. The kingdom of Christ advances. The Church is being built up and souls gathered into the Lord's harvest, even by means which at first threaten impediment and obstruction.

Now considering this general tendency and constant characteristic of the Christian religion,—that no disasters can crush it,—no persecution overwhelm it,—no prosperity can utterly corrupt it,—no schism can bring its downfall, but that misfortune seems to promote its welfare, and its very feebleness turns out to be its strength, contrary to all human expectations:—considering its wonderful powers of vitality, of expansion, of progress,—there is no conclusion but one that can explain its history, and that is,—this work must be of God, for if it were of men, it would under such trials have come to nought. The floods have arisen, and the rain has descended, and the winds have blown, and the stream has beat vehemently

upon the house, and it has not fallen. Its foundation therefore is the rock. Its builder and its maker is God.

It is well to accustom ourselves to the contemplation of the whole Catholic Church as one body, not to narrow our conceptions to particular parts of the Church, as if Christ were divided. Paul or Apollos or Cephas may be followed with undue zeal, and there may be greater or less purity of doctrine and practice in the separate branches,—the brethren may not agree,—but still it is the great spiritual kingdom which Christ has set up among men. Its magnitude, and its growth should be frequently in our thoughts to convince us of the Divine origin of the mighty body into which we have been engrafted. Consider how large a portion of the earth owns the lordship of Christ the crucified. Secure under its shadow, we do not sufficiently reflect on the magnitude of the vine. The wandering Arabs in the desert, familiar with the sight of the gigantic structures of the Pharaohs, think little of the vastness of the edifices, the solidity of these stony silent witnesses of the past. The fisherman dwelling near the sea, and concerned only with the outline of his own small bay, does not think of the vastness of the ocean of which he sees but a part. So we are apt to think too narrowly of the vast kingdom of Christ which has a witness in every land. The sun now never sets on its emblem, the Cross. It has been carried throughout nearly

the whole of the habitable globe. It proclaims everywhere the war between the spirit and the world. It is the badge of a system not *favouring* men's natural inclinations, but *opposing* them. It calls them away from things of sense to things unseen, apprehended by faith, future, spiritual; and yet it succeeds, and all the more, the more it is opposed. It is not a system pandering, like Mahometanism, to men's passions. It does not owe its advance to military conquest. It prevails while warring upon the desires of its own adherents. It gains strength through hostility, and is established through opposition. It is made perfect through sufferings. Can this be a human invention? Must we not say, 'Surely God is in this place'?

LECTURE VIII.

HEBREWS X. 39.

Them that believe to the saving of the soul.

WHEN we survey the different forms which opposition to Christianity assumes in the present day, we may clearly discern that there is one feature common to many—an aversion to the binding upon men belief in certain doctrines as essential to salvation. There is a deep-seated and widely-spread hostility to dogmatic Christianity.

When faith is explained only as a trust or confidence in God, it does not offend: there is a religious tendency in men's dispositions, which, even when ineffectual, yet inclines them to accept the reasonable doctrine of trust in God; but when it is asserted that there are certain *things* most necessary to be believed; *credenda*, in order to comply with the conditions under which eternal life or happiness is offered to man; then we find much opposition. Nevertheless the fundamental condition of admission to the blessings of the Christian covenant, 'to believe all the articles of the Christian faith,' is one which must be maintained by those who will resist the encroachment of that infidel spirit which threatens to level all

that is positive in Christianity. Sweeping assertions and sharp sayings often have most effect upon youthful minds. They ought to be put on their guard against disastrous results by suggesting to them certain considerations to act as antidotes to the destructive insinuations and objections which may be obtruded upon them from time to time.

The question is, Is it reasonable to suppose that eternal life, or eternal death, should depend upon a man's holding certain truths or disbelieving them? The answer is, that it *is* reasonable; considering faith in both its aspects, as intellectual and moral, as an operation of the understanding, and as an operation of the will—faith of the intellect, faith of the heart.

The objection is not new; it has prevailed at all times; and this prevalence may be taken as evidence of the truth of the assertion so often made in Holy Scripture, that man's heart is hostile to the Divine influence. The charges of credulity, and of resolving all religion into a mere persuasion of the mind, which were made in old times by the enemies of Christianity, presuppose that persuasion in the objectors to which we have referred, that to believe in certain *things* could not be a necessary point of true religion. Now, in order to shew that when the sacred writer speaks of belief to the saving of the soul, it is not unreasonable that this faith should include something more than trust or confidence, we may consider:—

1. That belief in revealed truths is, in a certain sense, a test of moral disposition.

2. That the objection is still farther answered by shewing that Christian doctrines are not barren tenets terminating in themselves, but are all highly influential, morally and spiritually.

It is not necessary to shew that a revelation is desirable. No one, as Paley says, pretends that we have too much knowledge about things divine and spiritual. On the contrary, most men admit at once that a Divine revelation would be an advantage to mankind; and if it be granted that the welfare of His creatures must be agreeable to the will of the Creator, it is then probable that He would grant them revelation of such things, unknown to them, as should conduce to their welfare; and confirmation of such things also as they could only find out with an uncertain probability. It seems reasonable that when such a revelation is made, the things revealed should be in great degree of a high spiritual nature, and sometimes not immediately commanding men's assent to their truth. It seems reasonable that in such a case, men should be accounted obedient or disobedient according as they believe or disbelieve what God has revealed.

The more intelligent statement of the objection would now be as follows: Can there be any moral excellence in believing that which is propounded on sufficient testimony, or anything of moral turpitude, in disbelieving that which is

propounded on insufficient testimony? If it be made apparent to a man's understanding that certain truths have been attested by a Divine testimony, he cannot help believing them; but if it cannot be made apparent to him that God has revealed them, he cannot incur any moral guilt by withholding his assent.

The fallacy in such a statement lies in the words 'on sufficient testimony,' and 'be made apparent to man's understanding.' There is no doubt that it would be a pardonable infirmity in a man whose mind was so constituted that he could not understand a mathematical demonstration: in such cases there is no room for faith or belief, a geometrical proposition is either known or not known: it is an object of Science, not of Faith; but moral evidence admits of degrees, which the other does not. 'Sufficient testimony' implies in the very term that it admits of greater or less, and the sufficiency of the testimony depends on the qualities of the mind to which it is presented. Its adequacy must depend on the amount of opposite prejudice or resistance with which it meets. The will acting on the understanding may prevail to oppose convictions of truths depending on moral evidence, or probable evidence; and it is clear that where the will is concerned, there may be moral qualities involved in assent or dissent. In a Divine revelation, there may be truths contained which clash with pre-conceived notions, which appear to contradict

generally received conclusions, and then the man who hesitates about believing will not perhaps reject them absolutely, but may set about diminishing, explaining, accommodating, or frittering away the truths at which his mind stumbles.

The degree in which he can succeed in this attempt must depend very much on the conduct of the understanding, before he comes to the investigation of revealed truths; and this conduct of the understanding is the result of the action of the will upon its powers and its qualities. So that belief in revealed truths or doctrinal deductions, and the degree in which things hard to be understood can be apprehended by the understanding, are results in a certain degree of the action of the will on the faculties, and in this light, and as far as it is concerned, the objection falls to the ground.

If it were written on the sky in letters of fire that Jesus Christ is God, there could be no discussion of the doctrine. It would not be a matter of faith or belief, but of certain absolute knowledge, quite as much as that there is a sun in the firmament; but if this truth is to be deduced from records and from testimony of man by reasonings and interpretations, there is room left for an exercise of the faculties in which they are influenced by the will. Men may argue that the record is not sufficiently clear to them, or the testimony not trustworthy, and if they have resolved that the proposition is one which seems to contradict their reason, the result of the investigation will be according to the

pliancy or obstinacy of their minds. Even in the apprehension of mathematical truths, those who have been much engaged in education know how wonderfully different are the capacities of different persons for arriving at conclusions; their powers of assent to strictly logical reasonings which have been settled by a series of powerful understandings, are extremely various in degree, and yet the variety partakes in many cases of a general character, so that we cannot but conclude that the *will* may have somewhat to do with the disability. And if in such a case there be room for this influence, there is much more scope for it when the steps of the deduction are by analogies and probabilities rather than by a closely woven chain of syllogisms.

The scriptural expression of this tendency in man is the depravation of the faculties since the fall; that the spirit of God strives with men, not irresistibly, but so that there should be room left for choice: according as the understanding is swayed by the corrupt will, so is the capacity for believing things divine. Our Lord's testimony to the Pharisees was, 'Ye *will* not come to me, that ye might have life.' While they urged that they wanted signs, and wished to know what was Christ's authority, he refused them because of their unwillingness to come to him. 'What sign shewest thou that thou doest such things? and who gave thee this authority?' do not seem unreasonable demands. But the reply of our Saviour

shews us that He considered there was already sufficient answer given, though they craved more. He knew that their wills were against believing on Him: and open proofs will not convince such men. 'If ye believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will ye believe though one rose from the dead.' And we have a remarkable instance recorded of the truth of these very words; for when Christ had raised Lazarus, of whose death they had had full certainty, some of them went their way to the Pharisees, to give information to them, and they consulted 'that they might put Lazarus also to death, because that by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus.'

In the valuable contributions made of late years to the theory of Education, it has been suggested as a matter of consideration whether that training of the faculties which is best promoted by the study of the Natural Sciences has received sufficient attention. It has been shewn that there is in these subjects a method of establishing conclusions abundantly sufficient to sway the judgment, but yet of a different kind to that which is employed in Mathematical Subjects strictly so called. I think it important that this should be viewed in connection with Religion. The reasoning by which many religious truths are established partakes often of the same character. And when it has been asserted, as shewing the unsoundness of the arguments by which the Christian faith is supported, that many of those who have attained high

positions in science have been unbelievers, it may well be answered that perhaps these persons have required proofs of a different kind to what they had any right to expect; and have thus failed to believe, because they were unprepared to follow a different method of reasoning—one which, quite as much as accurate logical deduction from simple propositions, was deserving of attention, and abundantly sufficient for the purpose to which it is applied.

If, as has been observed in a work well known amongst us—if there be certain prejudices which arise from cultivating the intellect by means of mathematics too exclusively¹—I fear that in the case of one who doubted of the truth of Christianity, and was endeavouring to satisfy himself of its evidences, they would be very much felt. It must have been from such a persuasion too that Butler conceived that the argument from analogy would be useful, as it indeed proved itself to be in his skilful hands. A mind accustomed to this method of argument must receive considerable satisfaction from the study of such an author, especially when the object is to remove objections to revealed doctrines which cannot be satisfactorily met by direct logical sequences from universally admitted premises. Now the influence which such a method can obtain over men's judgments depends in a great degree upon their moral disposition. The force of an analogy is according to the freshness, the candour of

¹ Whewell, *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, Vol. I. xliii.

the enquirer. It sways more or less according as the man's mind is less or more warped by prejudice, according to his moral ἦθος: and if this be granted, then we think it goes a very long way to contradict the objection that believing and disbelieving are unconnected with moral qualifications. If the testimony to revealed truths be sufficient, generally speaking, that is, if there be reasonable grounds for conclusions, in the estimation of a large number of ordinarily competent persons, this secures us against any objection which can be made *generally*. And at the same time it gives scope to a moral use of the faculties. Strong probable evidence *ought* to convince mankind. Yet inasmuch as it leaves room for choice, it seems exactly suited to the object of moral probation. The rejection or acceptance of the truths so propounded, becomes a test of the disposition of the will. Acceptance of difficult truths on the authority of Divine revelation, testified by evidence generally sufficient, shews that there has been a desire to progress in spiritual things. Rejection shews that the judgment is perverted, or party-coloured, or resolutely tends in a direction different to that in which the evidence was calculated to have weight.

If there are some persons whose judgments are essentially not convincible by that ordinary evidence which is sufficient to sway others, each man would require a revelation specially to himself. Now are we not to expect that in this case, God

would act on the *usual* plan of Divine government—viz. by general laws? And, therefore, there *must* be degrees in which a man assents to certain truths coming to him with a claim to belief. We *can* resist evidence of the kind proffered, in a greater or less degree. Willingness to believe is an ingredient in the mental process by which conclusions of this kind are arrived at. And, therefore, faith in things revealed is a test of the disposition of men's minds, and ultimately of moral tendencies.

I ought not to leave this argument without repudiating that view of the testimony to Divine truths, which some have advanced, viz. that it is *only* of a general probable kind. I have been obliged, in urging the reasons for considering the morality of faith, to take up the objection as it is put by opponents; but having already on other occasions endeavoured to maintain the infallible testimony of miracles, and to reassert and establish the grounds of belief which so many defenders of religion have in old time put forward, I need not do more on the present occasion than reiterate the persuasion which I entertain, and would earnestly inculcate on others. Though it is true that the evidence is not a mathematical demonstration now to us, yet we have the *very highest* probability. In fact the certainty (as we may well call it,) of the truth of Christianity in its *external* character is such that its opponents are rarely found. Its real and dangerous enemies are those who allow the exterior walls to be strong and valid, but labour to

corrupt its internal character. For belief in revelation and revealed truths, they profess the greatest possible reverence; but in their faithless hands the revealed truth becomes a nonentity, and within the walls of the fortress they fritter away the terms of allegiance till they have no meaning. If urged with the fact of the constant proclamation of the necessity of faith, they resolve it into trust in God only; and, therefore, in controversy with such opponents as these, it may not be amiss to remember that belief in certain doctrines, to which their system is abhorrent, is yet capable of defence on general grounds, antecedent to the consideration of the express command, and does not involve any such difficulty as has been alleged against it.

But there remains yet another very important view in which this subject should be considered. Belief in certain doctrines, though it may be maintained as necessary to shew obedience to the will of God as a mere abstract faith, is yet really in Christianity of a very different kind.

The requirement of belief in certain propositions does not in reality arise mainly from this consideration, but because the propositions themselves have certain definite ends in view. 'Excepting,' says Bp Taylor¹, 'that it acknowledges God's veracity, and so is a direct act of religion, believing a revealed proposition hath no excellency in itself, but in order to that end for which we are instructed in such revelations.' That end is that

¹ *Liberty of Prophecy.*

we should be brought to God. Born again and adopted as sons of God, we are to be sanctified, or made holy, in order that we may be meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints.

Christianity assumes that man is of himself unable to be saved, and provides a salvation for him. In requiring of him faith as the primary condition under which he may become a subject of God's grace in Christ, it is provided that the doctrines which he is called upon to believe are all intimately related to the great work of redemption, and the salvation of the individual man—and especially is this true of those doctrines at which men stumble in God's word. The Incarnation and the Atonement, the personal agency of the Holy Ghost, and the Resurrection—all these are doctrines on which hang the substance of Christianity. When conscience-stricken with thoughts of the numberless ways in which we have offended our Almighty Father, in thought, and word, and deed, how can we hope for forgiveness, unless there should be some mediator between us, who will ward off from us the justly deserved punishment of our sins? How can such a mediator be cognizant of the weakness and frailty of flesh and blood, how can he sympathize with us, and how could he leave us an example that we may know how we ought to walk and to please God, except he were man, of like nature with ourselves? And how can a man bring us near to God, since no man can make an agreement unto God for his brother, having his

own imperfections to overcome; how can any one exalt human nature to a higher scale of being, unless he be himself above it; and since we are promised that we shall be partakers of the Divine nature¹, who but God could have bestowed such a gift? Then how are we now to be brought into the perfect state to which we are tending? Can ought but a Divine agency effect this? Must not our Paraclete be Divine, as well as our Mediator and Pattern? And then to what kind of life are we destined—a merely spiritual life, in which our faculties would be different to what they now are, and our persuasion of its reality dim and indistinct? Will our redemption be complete unless we are set free from the bondage of mortality? By such questions passing through the mind, we become convinced that even though they be mysterious, difficult, and requiring considerable effort on the part of man to believe them, as abstract truths, yet the doctrines I have mentioned are connected as closely as possible with the hopes and aspirations of Christian men. They all involve deep principle, they lie at the root of our religion, and they are required of men to be believed because of this their intimate relation to the practical, spiritual needs of mankind. A dry assent to a scholastic definition is not a fit subject of comparison with belief in truths like these. And though we have said that the condition of believing in any abstract proposition which comes to us depending on *Divine*

¹ 2 Pet. i. 4.

testimony to its truth, is not an unfitting trial of man's willing obedience, yet such a condition of salvation is as far removed as possible from the essential and fundamental conditions under which salvation is actually offered to man in the Gospel. Their object is not at all to try men's patience by strivings about things to no profit. When difficult, it is because of the inherent difficulty of the case. To bring a sinful world into a state of reconciliation with God, and change it into a holy brotherhood, is no such easy matter, due regard being had that none of God's attributes shall be offended, that all His promises and threatenings shall stand, that He shall be a God punishing iniquity, transgression, and sin, a God that will by no means clear the guilty, and yet a God delighting in mercy and longsuffering, a God pardoning iniquity, and a God who will wash away the sins of the ungodly. That in the carrying out and completing of the great work of redemption, wonderful mysteries should have to be accomplished, cannot be matter of surprise to any one who will consider all the depths of the subject. If intelligent obedience, and purity, and complete self-surrender, are to be wrought in the wilfully sinful, the impure, and the selfish, the means thereto must be wonderful; and the demand made upon mankind is not unreasonable, that they should believe in the truth of what God reveals to them in this matter. When we add thereto that all the hard things which are the objects of faith, are absolutely and intimately

bound up with the actual working out of the scheme, and its efficient application to the case of each Christian—then it is no longer in the least degree subject of marvel, that belief in these things should be commanded, and made the watchword or symbol of the disciple. Belief to the saving of the soul, so far from being subject of difficulty, becomes the most reasonable of doctrines, because to return to God we must be prepared to hear Him, and to follow where He points out the road of our return.

These considerations seem to me well qualified to obviate the difficulty which men have felt in receiving the doctrine of faith.

The evidence being generally sufficient, the belief or disbelief is according to the action of the will upon the judgment, and therefore is not an improper test of a man's general disposition.

And the doctrines in which belief is required are not *mere* trials of men's disposition, but they relate in all cases to practical Christianity. They are necessary to the full understanding and realizing of its method.

I pass on to a kindred subject, of considerable importance, especially when we have regard to the audience before whom these Lectures are delivered.

If faith is established most easily in minds that have had the largest and most comprehensive training, if there are moral qualities in faith, arising out of the conduct of the understanding, these facts

must be matters of very serious import in a place of education.

Not only have we had instances of men so hardened in understanding as to be incapable of receiving any but mathematical proof, and therefore making shipwreck of the faith—we have also seen a large class of persons lately led to leave the Church for the Roman schism, whose judgments were logic-bound, and who have become complete slaves to the conclusions they could draw from their premises syllogistically, because they could not take more comprehensive views, and views more consistent with the moral and spiritual laws which govern mankind, and which refuse to be bound by the chains of a scholastic discipline. In both cases the judgment has not been free but constrained.

Intellectual habits are formed by intellectual processes reacting on the judgment, and then the conclusions arrived at are one-sided. To preserve the power of free judgment must be an object to be aimed at, and the possession of such a blessing is not to be secured without diligent care and constant vigilance. We ought to watch in ourselves the ultimate as well as the proximate results of mental processes. The conduct of the understanding is a matter of vast importance, on it depends no less than the capacity for apprehending the objects of faith. It must be attended to with the utmost care. Holy Scripture compares the understanding to the eye. 'The light of the body is the

eye. If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness.'

The eye, the instrument by which light acts upon the mind, is the human understanding. Christ himself as revealed in the Gospel is the light of the world. The action of this Divine light upon the soul is different in different persons, not from any variation in the external brightness, but from the qualities of the eye or instrument. 'If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light,' i. e. if the understanding be clear, unwarped by prejudices, candid, open to impression in the way that the influence tends, many-sided, then the flood of Divine light passes inwards and illuminates the soul with its full radiance; things are seen in their true colour, all parts are seen and at their proper distance and in their proper proportion; the image of God is imprinted on the soul, and it is a true image, and not one distorted, dim, perplexed, and out of proportion. Such a man learns the true will of God, because he offers of his own accord no impediment to the Divine illumination. He is transformed by the full power of that light which is meant for the enlightenment of all men. 'But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness:' the eye which is defective, and therefore transmits false impressions to the judgment, is like the perverted, vitiated, debilitated understanding, whose conclusions are erroneous while conscientious. Sometimes the eye will get impressed

with one particular colour till it can recognize none but that colour and its complementary colour. So is the understanding influenced, when it forces all conclusions to a state of subserviency to one foregone conclusion, or to a direct antagonism with it. The eye which represents external objects distorted, is like the understanding which is tortuous, perplexed, crooked, and perverse, which ever sees a fallacy where there is none, and refuses to see an acknowledged flaw, which dwells ever upon a refuted objection, which always bends all arguments one way, will only estimate at one value, will always impart to every view a twist of its own supplying. The eye which has a dim image is like the softened and enervated understanding, which can never arrive at a conclusion, which mistrusts all that it fancies it approves, and has a tender anxious misgiving for all that it fancies it condemns. It is always wavering, doubting, depending on others, helpless, halting, inconclusive.

I might follow out the simile with minuteness into many other particulars. It has always seemed to me one of the most remarkable which the Scriptures have given us; but it is sufficient to indicate it to rouse up in most men's minds a conviction of the aptitude of the comparison. Now the culture, management, tending of the understanding,—the great business of education,—will have a most important influence on the faith of the individual, when he comes to argue with himself of the grounds of his belief. And as this belief involves 'saving

of the soul,' it is important that the faculties by which faith is to be wrought in us, should be in their perfect state. Having said enough already about mental qualities, I ought before leaving this, to add a word of caution as to moral habits, as they have an important influence on the understanding. The whole testimony of mankind is in one direction on the first point, that sensuality—the giving way to the baser passions of humanity—tends directly to the deterioration of the faculty of judging. Indulgence acts on the mind as it does on the body. It enervates, softens, degrades, and destroys. The coarser elements of human nature, when encouraged and pampered, absorb the energy which would have produced a vigorous, severe, noble, and fruitful intellect. Even though the powers of some men, mental and corporeal, may seem to withstand the assaults which they permit their passions to make upon their nobler qualities, yet we may be well assured, that no natural laws of God can be infringed: damage and loss must result from such treatment. We must all be held guilty for the degree in which we fall short of that vigour of mind which we *might* have attained, if we had not frittered away our powers, and debased our standard: not what we *are*, compared with others, but what we *are*, compared with what we *might* have been, if we had not of our own selves frustrated God's great work within us, and stunted its growth, must be the measure of our culpability. The vigour and tenacity with which we embrace

the truth will be according to our mental powers, but according to our mental powers, such as we have made them, and not as God gave them to us in germ. If we have enfeebled them, so that they cannot grasp the objects of faith, on us must be the penalty, justly awarded, because the talent committed to us has not been put out to usury, but squandered in the service of Satan instead of the service of God.

Nearly as fatal to the quality of the understanding is indolence. The position of a student in the university at the commencement of his career, is full of temptation of various kinds, but especially of temptation to indolence.

Its effect again upon the intellect is like its effect upon the body: it enervates. There is also danger that in neglect of the studies and pursuits of the place, if the evil passions do not obtain the mastery, the imagination may yet be more developed than the reasoning faculties, and this is an evil to be deprecated. A luxuriant imagination, kept in check by no bonds of severe reason, is a source of many dangers. It is hostile to the formation of a keen, piercing, subtle, and critical judgment. It sways decisions by other motives than those of sound reason. It places a man in a dangerous position, if ever the tempter should suggest thoughts of infidelity or of schism.

The development and guidance of the mental powers of the young is a trust of awful importance, and when men are meditating on changes in the

system, they ought to be mindful of the weighty charge they undertake. If such alterations be carried out with any other motive than a pure and honest desire to produce something better, higher, and more Christian in its tendency, we may be sure that a very deep and grievous responsibility will be incurred. It is no light matter to meddle with systems of such extensive influence. May God grant that in all changes the really important end may be kept in view, that all who are intrusted to the teaching of this seat of sound learning and religious education may be more and more influenced for their good in the highest sense, i. e. may be prepared to be intelligent, honest, and conscientious Christians.

Lastly, we may notice that belief in certain revealed propositions, because they are taught us by God, is also an operation of faith viewed in its other capacity, viz. as *trust* or *confidence* in God. Under both its aspects, it is concerned in the production of 'belief to the saving of the soul.'

Now there is something in faith, trust, or confidence in God, which renders it peculiarly fit to be the condition of salvation. In most other virtues there is a mixture of some selfish feeling, or at any rate a feeling of self-love. In faith there is nothing of this alloy. It is a casting away of self, to repose entirely upon God. In this complete confidence and reliance on God, there is humility, diffidence, acknowledgment of helplessness, generous self-abasement—a childlike clinging to the

One greater, mightier, and wiser—complete submission.

It is well worth our meditation to consider thus the excellency of faith: 'Faith is the parent of charity; and whatsoever faith entertains must be apt to produce love to God¹.' In its highest sense it developes itself into charity, the greatest of Christian graces; because a thorough trust and confidence in one who is incapable of deceiving us, or failing us through weakness, leads immediately to the love of God, which is to be the surviving, never-ending Christian grace.

As deference and submission to earthly parents on the part of children is natural and pleasing, and must be secured in order to influence them for their good, and as this is always intimately connected with affection and veneration, so must the same law prevail in matters spiritual and religious. If we would be the children of God, we must have deference, submission, trust, confidence in God. There can be no recognition of God as our Father, unless we have this faith. Christ gives us an example of the practical effect of faith, when he submitted Himself to the will of the Father in all things. 'I came not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me.' Our mission is similar—we are to seek to thwart our own wills in order to follow the will of God. And the great work which we have to do, in accordance with His revealed will, is to believe. 'This is the will of

¹ Jer. Taylor, *Holy Living*.

Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.’

Let us then take heed that we cultivate in ourselves that disposition of mind which leads to faith—that we zealously strive against the contrary disposition which perverts the powers of free judgment. Let us approach the Sacred Records with desire to believe—desire to learn the truths of revelation—that we may embrace them heartily, and act upon them. Then there is not the smallest shadow of doubt that the striving of the Spirit will result in the victory which overcometh the world, even in our faith. And thus we shall be amongst those who believe to the saving of the soul.

This faith, saith Bishop Taylor¹, is the foundation of a good life—the foundation of all our hopes: it is that without which we cannot live well, and without which we cannot die well: it is a grace that we shall *then* need to support our spirits, to sustain our hopes, to alleviate our sickness, to resist temptation, to prevent despair. Upon the belief of the Articles of our Religion we can do the works of a holy life—upon belief of the promises we can bear sickness patiently, and die cheerfully.

May this faith be wrought in each one of us here present, by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¹ *Holy Dying.*

CAMBRIDGE :
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

A
SERMON
FOR
GOOD FRIDAY.

Sermon for Good Friday.

Preached before the University on *April 14, 1854.*

S. LUKE XXIII. 28.

Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves.

WE are now come to the day of most awful commemoration in the Christian Church—the final consummation and close of the Jewish dispensation, taken away by God that He might establish the second covenant—a day on which the marvellous spectacle of the Son of God expiring on the cross was exhibited to angels and men; the public testimony from on High against the malignity of sin; a solemn and severe example, such as we can barely comprehend in its deep and world-wide extent; and moreover, the most singular exhibition of Divine love towards mankind, that we so frail, so sinful, so lost, should be ransomed at a cost so transcendent.

To-day the Church bids us contemplate the sufferings of the ‘author and finisher of our salvation;’ to behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto His sorrow; any pangs so great as those which the offended justice of God exacted from Him—from Him who alone could have borne them.

If we have been moved by the solemn recital of Christ’s agonies, if our warmer feelings have

been called into action on this day, and the pathetic story of our Saviour's endurance of all that can be conceived most painful and degrading has made us feel in our hearts the sympathetic yearnings of pity and grief, let us ever remember that our sins brought all this to pass—our transgressions added bitterness to His cup of sorrow—our wanderings and offences called down the Divine wrath on the devoted head of the Lamb of God.

And let us mourn for the sad cause of all the woes that Christ suffered ; let us weep, and pray, and humble ourselves in God's sight, that so the work of salvation may be accomplished in us, and we may be found worthy to share in the blessings of the heavenly inheritance which that precious sacrifice has earned for faithful Christian penitents.

It is to this recognition of individual unworthiness that the gospel is pre-eminently calculated to lead us, and we will endeavour, with God's blessing, to assist you in your meditations this morning, by considering Christ's sorrows, and the way in which we should ponder over them ; first, referring to some of the many ways in which we may regard those sufferings, and then to the human affections which they ought to call forth,—penitential sorrow, and humble gratitude.

Few subjects are so calculated to affect the stubborn and rebellious nature of man ; but, at the same time, to speak worthily of such a theme is impossible. Bear, brethren, with the imperfections of expression which we cannot avoid in

speaking of these great mysteries, and endeavour to realise inwardly the fruits of pious meditation, that you may heartily feel the deep devotion of the ancient Christian hymn—

Faint and weary Thou hast sought me,
 On the Cross of Suffering bought me,
 Shall such Grace be vainly brought me?
 Low I kneel with heart submission,
 See, like ashes, my contrition;
 Help me in my lost condition.

God '*hath laid on him the iniquities of us all.*' To appreciate the weight of this enormous burden, we must recur to the effects produced by this infliction of His Father. '*He suffered.*' This suffering was both corporeal and mental: He suffered in His body—in His affections—in His soul. The scourge, the nails, the piercing thorns, produced in His sacred body the most sharp and painful sensations. The violent tearing of the most sensitive members produced a deep and grievous anguish. '*The ploughers ploughed upon his back, and made long furrows.*' Add to this the bitterness of suffering, in the stretching of his tender limbs upon the cross, the racking aches which such a posture must have caused, the hard and merciless iron entering into his inmost soul, exposed for three long hours¹, to the scorching heat—no transient pangs, but acute and lingering tortures, intended by malicious cruelty to be thus searching, grievous, lasting; (for '*they marvelled*

¹ 'Six hours.' *Barrow*, Vol. I. p. 426, quoting S. Mark xv. 25, 34.—'Three hours.' *Bp Taylor*, Vol. III. p. 350, *Life of Christ*.

that he had died so soon,') and let each one think for himself, when he reflects on the pain caused by ordinary human ills, what must have been the exquisite nature of that corporeal suffering which the Saviour of men underwent for his sake.

But, not only in His body did our Saviour suffer : He was 'a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief' in His affections likewise. He had chosen twelve to be with Him and share His present humility. He had opened out to them the matchless scenes of future glory. He had taught them, and borne with them, and loved them unto the end. Three especially were attached to His own person ; one of them emphatically designated as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' These three were with Him in the garden of Gethsemane. They could neither sympathise with His sorrow, nor watch for His safety. They slept, while He prayed and was in His agony. They fled when He was apprehended. They had walked together in the house of God as friends, and taken sweet counsel together, and S. John reclined affectionately in his bosom at the last Supper—but they were now gone. Fear put a bar between His friends and Him, and He is left alone.

He who had come to bring mankind reconciliation with God, to make those who through sin were alienated, sons of God and joint-heirs with Himself of glory, is now abandoned by them. He came to bring God near to man, and while He found that man had rejected Him, there is added

to this the withdrawal of God's countenance, which hitherto had sustained Him. *'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'*

His love for man was contemned and despised. His miraculous power, which had ever been exerted for their good, turned into a jeer and an insult. His omniscient foreknowledge derided and insulted. His divine teaching accused of being seditious and blasphemous. The heathen Pilate was ashamed of their malicious violence; His brethren after the flesh, with such frantic and inveterate hate, so urged, and insisted, and clamoured for His death. And, when at last He was nailed to the accursed tree, the sneers and cruel mockings of the chief priests and scribes were taken up by the wretched malefactors, whose crimes met with a due reward in their deaths. Can we conceive any circumstance that might have been added to the scene which could have made Him feel more bitter pangs of slighted love and rejected mercy? Could scorn have done more? Could His affections have been harrowed by any more violent torture? His feelings wrung by ingratitude more base,—obstinacy more unrelenting?

Yet, further, our Saviour suffered in His soul. He knew what sin was; He knew what the dreadful punishment of sin was; He moreover knew what was God's hatred of sin; He himself had the most divine graces infused into His soul, and had the greatest habitual detestation of all ini-

quity. All the iniquity of the world now rested upon *Him*. He *bore* our sins. The burden was laid on His shoulders; and He knew what the burden was. This makes the chief ingredient of His bitter portion. The man that dies in his sins knows not what sin is, till he comes to the judgment-seat of God. We know not the full measure of the sinfulness of sin. We *cannot* know it. One sin unrepented of must have consequences tremendous in their intensity, infinite in duration: what can we then know of the burden of the sins of the whole world?

Again, our Saviour knew that these sins were against God. He knew the evil and guilt of sin; the offence against the majesty of God; the ingratitude against His goodness. He knew how God hated all sin. He bore that hatred. God turned away his face from Him. He cried out in the agony of this anticipated trial, '*My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death;*' and in actual experience of it, when *His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground*, '*Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.*' We can know but little of the dreadful agonies of soul that our Saviour endured: His fearful apprehensions; His unknown sorrows; His unutterable anguish; but we can feel how much is contained in those touching words of the Greek Litany: 'By all thine unknown sufferings, unknown to us, but known and felt by thee, Lord, have mercy on us and

save us.' 'By all thine unknown sufferings, Christ, have mercy upon us.' Now, what effect should this consideration of Christ's suffering produce? We must not rest in a barren and fruitless sympathy for Him in His affliction; not expend our tears in sentimental sorrow, which does not reach the *cause* of His grief. Deep pangs, brethren, do not thus betray themselves. The inward mourning of the heart is more full of sincerity than the outward display of lamentation, and mourning, and woe. While we cry out in the words of Jeremiah, 'O that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people,' we must remember that 'He was wounded for *our* transgressions, He was bruised for *our* iniquities'—we must recal the words of our Lord himself, 'Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves.'

Our sorrow and affliction this day must be for *sin*. It was *sin* that brought the Son of God from heaven to suffer and die—the sins of the whole world, and therefore *our* sins—our individual sins. We must then mourn for these. We must be like those whom Ezekiel saw in prophetic vision, 'all of them mourning, every one for his iniquity.' The thoughts of our redemption completed must work the same penitence within us; for thus saith the same prophet, when setting forth the restoration to God's favour of the apostate tribes, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall

be clean ; a new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you ; and I will save you from your uncleanness, and I will be your God. Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall lothe yourselves in your own eyes for your iniquities and your abominations.'

We must exclaim when we behold the effects of God's anger displayed in the dreadful sacrifice of Mount Calvary, ' Lord, thou *hast not* dealt with us after our sins, nor remembered us according to our iniquities.' We can learn from that sad spectacle the heavy punishment that sin deserves, and feel that we are spared. We must learn that God hath wrought with us ' for His name's sake, and not according to our wicked ways, nor according to our corrupt doings,' (Ezek. xx. 44). He hath *not* laid on us the penalty that we had deserved ; but on Him hath God laid the sins of the whole world. He bare our sins in His own body on the cross, and therefore we should mourn and lament and bewail our evil propensities.

Amid the thousand pangs that He endured, some there were which *our* wilfulness and obstinacy inflicted ; some there were which *our* indulgence in sinful pleasures procured for Him ; some which *our* corrupt appetites produced.

The load under which He groaned was increased by burdens which *we* have thrown upon Him—the weight of which would have crushed *us*.

The cross He carried was erected partly by *our*

hands—the nails were driven by *us*. We helped to stretch His weary limbs; and, added to the thorns with which His sacred temples were torn, His tender body was rent by scourges which we had prepared. We were the cause of some aggravation of His agonies; our sinful lusts filled up the cup of His bitterness. *He knew this*, and therefore He now addresses us in the words of the text: ‘Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves.’ If we understood this fully, and would feel it, such sorrow should be ours as no human calamities could draw from us; we should not then see man’s fiercest outpourings of grief in the chamber of death. We should not then seek the churchyard and the funeral procession for the shedding of man’s bitterest tears; but the ascent of the House of God on Good Friday would witness the deepest humiliation;—a result of the utmost workings of his soul. And *there* should the penitent pour forth the tears which the memory of the shameful and painful death of Christ should bring into his eyes; causing him to weep and lament for the sins of a mis-spent life, then expiated and washed away. No transient emotions or passing sorrows should be felt by the sinner who knows himself a sinner; who knows what sin is; who knows that the Lamb of God was slain, with every aggravation of cruel mocking and scornful reproach—with shame and dreadful torture—on HIS account. Tears of blood, and grief that knows no bounds, would be the just tribute that he

should then bring. Baptized in blood, and enduring the martyr's most intense agonies, he would feel that this was far short of the grief he *would* manifest if he could but know the extent of the anguish Christ endured for him. We *cannot* know it, brethren ; God mercifully interposes to save us the knowledge,—our feeble conceptions are not strong enough, our imaginations fail—we are left far behind in this trial of grief,—immeasurably distanced in the contest of sorrow with the King of Grief. How, indeed, shall we measure the costliness of His blood ? How can *we* count up the woes of Christ ? The leaves of autumn and the stars of heaven are outnumbered. We can make but *one* offering to God in return for all this—a poor and miserable offering indeed—but one which God will accept, 'The sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart,' which, in His sight, is of great price.

This, then, let us render to-day. Let the Passion of our Lord be imprinted on our hearts ; let their stony hardness be broken, by this memorial imprinted there by the finger of God ; let the strongholds of sin be cast down, and the chamber be swept and garnished ; but let it not remain *empty*, but pray that God would take possession of it by His grace, and occupy it evermore. Let the image of God be restored to our inner man. Let Christ descend into our hearts this day as He did into the tomb, not to quit them, but to remain there for ever, in a dwelling consecrated

to His use, and freed from all impurity; that having wept for ourselves with tears of sincerity, He may wipe away the tears from our eyes, and restore us to heavenly serenity and peace. Let the fierce contentions of our passions cease in the presence of Him who bid the elements obey Him, and 'there was a great calm.' May the pride that dwelt there be subdued before Him who was meek and lowly, and dwelt amongst His disciples as one that serveth. May the covetousness that reigned there be driven out before Him whose meat and drink was to do the will of God; who was content to fulfil all that will, for it was written in His heart. May all evil concupiscence be put to flight before Him who knew no sin.

May all the stains of sin be wept over and repented of, that it may please Him to wash us and cleanse us in that blood of purification which was, as on this day, poured out, and that we may finally be brought to heaven, ransomed, cleansed, justified, sanctified, and received up into glory, delivered 'By his agony and bloody sweat, By his cross and passion, By his precious death and burial.'

If we will make this day one of mourning after this sort, a mourning for sin, the cause of all the deeds of blood which were completed in the crucifixion, then shall we have benefitted truly by the words of Christ, 'Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves.'

Our tears, however, though full of bitterness,

must not be *exclusively* so. We *must* weep tears of remorse, but we *may* also weep tears of gratitude. Mingled with our sorrow for the cause of Christ's agonies, must there ever arise within us feelings of grateful love towards Him who underwent all this for our sakes. 'Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it.' 'This love of Christ,' saith St Paul, 'passeth knowledge,' for he commendeth his love towards us in that being yet sinners, Christ died for us. 'For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die;' but what is the measure of *that* love to man, which made the Lord of Glory die for His enemies, pray blessings on those that blasphemed and cursed him, give life to His murderers? Surely this is condescension,—affection,—which will cause a grateful return from each sinful heart. 'Greater love hath no man than this,' said our Saviour himself, 'that a man lay down his life for his friends,' and, 'I lay down my life for the sheep.' Surely the greatest love that can be shewn towards man shall meet with *some* return from its objects. St Paul says, 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed.' Now if we judge of Christ's love towards us from the things which He suffered on our behalf, we cannot but be raised to the highest pitch of admiration and gratitude. We cannot but admit that if the greatest possible love is manifested in laying down one's life for the sake and benefit of others, then, how great

must that affection have been which wrought upon Christ so that He made this great sacrifice in *such* a manner, with *such* dreadful attendant circumstances of shame and sorrow? The noble sacrifice of life which men have been reported to have made in ancient story, strike us sometimes with awe. Grecian heroism and Roman fortitude have been chronicled in illustrious instances of self-immolation for the love of fatherland or in the spirit of clanship. And we cannot but feel warmed as we read the record of their generous enthusiasm. Turn we to the Gospel, and let us ponder there on the scenes which this day have been peculiarly brought to our memories. The glorious applause that awaited the voluntary martyr in the Forum is not read of in these pages. No public recognition of benefits conferred was attendant on Christ's sacrifice. The shout of popular approbation, and the good will of the attendant spectators, are alike wanting. The Son of God lays down his life amidst the despondency of his friends, the cowardice of his attendants, the scorn and hatred of the rulers and chief priests. No sound of human sympathy greeted his ears but the lamentations of a few women among the multitude who wept for his death, because they understood not its import. No look of pity or tender compassion was attendant on his sufferings, except from a timorous band of three faithful women, and the beloved disciple. He was put to death amidst the exultations of his enemies, in company with

the most contemptible of malefactors. Sacrificed by a pusillanimous ruler to the frenzy of the multitude, the victim of acknowledged injustice, offered up to death to quell distant apprehensions of visionary tumults. None of the circumstances attended the execution that have conspired to make men's bosoms glow with unwonted fires, and prompt them to the sacrifice of their lives for others' sake. If we look, then, no further, yet here was a sacrifice greater than any the world ever did or shall witness. But when we add, the dignity of the person on whom these outrages were perpetrated, and the object of his errand, we cannot but confess that love, such as this, is immeasurably beyond all that it hath entered man's heart to conceive. Love, such as this, when thought upon, and weighed, and considered, must make the bosom glow and the heart burn. There can be none so obdurate, so dead to all sense of generous feeling, as not to be stirred by the recital of the woes of the prophet of Nazareth. And though he bids us not weep for him, but for ourselves, yet we cannot but yearn with inexpressible longings, to testify by some few tears of joy, the grateful sense we entertain of benefits so immense, a sacrifice so precious, endurance so humble, love of such infinite tenderness. Such then be our grief this day; let it be keen and piercing for our own sinfulness and unworthiness; but let it be withal mingled with a grateful remembrance of the love manifested towards us in the painful

martyrdom of our Lord and Saviour. Weep for yourselves tears of penitence. Weep for our Saviour tears of grateful homage. Let there be a recognition of sin and of love ; of sin on our parts, of love on his part ; and let the mingled stream in unaffected earnestness and sincerity flow fast and copiously. May the image of the cross, imprinted on our brows in infancy, be deeply graven on our hearts, and sink deeper and deeper with every returning anniversary of Passion Week. May our weary eyes rest upon the wounds our sins have inflicted. May we look to the pierced side from whence our sacraments flowed forth, and realize in every celebration of the sacrifice the vital powers of the body and blood of our crucified Redeemer. May we live in him by faith, and make the remembrance of his great expiation an incentive to penitential abasement and grateful adoration. That on Easter Day we may turn our tears into triumphant joy ; our solemn humble confessions into glorious hymns of faith, hope and love. He that now goeth on his way weeping shall doubtless come again with joy, sharing in the condition of his Divine Master, who, after being made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, is seen crowned with glory and honour.

A
SERMON
FOR
EASTER SUNDAY.

Sermon for Easter Day.

Preached before the University on *April 16, 1854.*

ROMANS VI. 4.

As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of God the Father, even we also should walk in newness of life.

THE celebration of Christian fasts and festivals in the Church, calling, as they do, upon its members to shew forth various emotions of humiliation or of joy, raise up at times very unsatisfactory reflections. The Church puts into the mouths of the worshippers in her courts, words which speak of deep and heartfelt affections; the language of her Liturgy is not a barren expression of mere transient feelings; it is meant to be the outpouring of sincere, earnest, genuine hearts.

On Friday last we used words of penitential sorrow; we were called upon to mourn with the Son of God, when undergoing, for our sakes, the bitter pains of death, and the temporary hiding of God's face; to-day we are bid to exult in God's infinite mercy; to rejoice in the completion of the deliverance; to thank God for his faithfulness, shewed in the midst of destruction, and to bless him for the certainty we have obtained of the stability of his covenant, that it is indeed everlasting. And I think we cannot contemplate with-

out apprehension, the fact that we are now appealed to on the subject of such mighty truths, and that we have all taken into our mouths solemn and significant words, the outward expressions of those inward feelings which the Church formularies suppose in us. And yet, it is a moral certainty, that numbers among us do not in any degree feel the sorrow at Christ's death, or the joy at his resurrection, which we pretend to when we join in Christian worship. The veriest trifle of human misfortune will cause us more distress than the rehearsal of the agonies of Gethsemane; the most meagre occasion of human joy will stir in us more exultation of heart than will the words 'The Lord is risen indeed.' The history of our Saviour's death and resurrection is one to which we have so often listened; all its circumstances are so familiar to us, that our emotions, when the record is again brought under our notice, are only vapid and transitory. And if this be the case, how can we to-day, for instance, really feel such buoyant and triumphant hopes as shall make us join *with sincerity* in the glorious hymns of praise and thanksgiving with which our church-walls ring? If we feel but a dull interest in the fact of the resurrection of our Lord, surely there is something of hypocrisy in making this our High Festival; and, as we know that in every congregation there must be many who are not walking in the way of everlasting salvation, as we know that many who say 'Lord, Lord,' are to be disowned

by the Saviour in the day of account, it is right and proper that we should endeavour to convince ourselves how deeply we must offend the Almighty, if in such holy services as those we are to-day engaged in, we allow ourselves to be self-convicted, by the testimony of our own consciences, of pretending to feel joy to which we are strangers, and to have hopes, about the *reality* of which we are unconcerned.

I feel it to be a moral certainty, that there may be many amongst us who have not considered that they are acting hypocritically in making this day an occasion of joy. To enable us to convince our own minds of this truth, let us consider what the apostle tells us is the moral lesson conveyed by the fact of the resurrection, to all those who, having been baptized into Christ, have been buried with him by baptism, into death. It is this: *As Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of God the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life.*

‘*Newness of life.*’—What do these words mean? Do they convey to us any distinct and tangible idea? or do they give an uncertain sound? This is to be the end wrought in us by the resurrection of Christ, if we profit by the monitions of that final consummation of the earthly sojourn of our Saviour. Before, then, we thank God for the resurrection, we should ascertain whether we are the *children of the resurrection*, i. e. we should endeavour to find out whether we know anything of this ‘*walk in newness of life.*’ Let us therefore de-

vote this exercise to an inquiry into the meaning of these words ; we shall then have words of warning and of consolation for the respective classes into which we shall find ourselves divided, for we *are* either walking in newness of life, or we are *not*. We cannot be neutral. ‘He that is not with me is against me,’ saith our Saviour. ‘Ye cannot serve two masters,’ saith He in another place. And it is manifest that we cannot thank God for the resurrection of His Son if we find that we have altogether missed the great end which the resurrection should have wrought in us.

What is the newness of life of which the apostle speaks? A description of the *new life* is given in the Epistle for Easter-Day: ‘If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.’ It is not sufficient, however, that we take the words of Scripture, and dwell upon their well-known sound. It is the practical meaning of them that we are concerned with: we are too apt to rest contented with the use of a familiar phrase, or a conventional expression, without inquiring into its deep import. The meaning of the verses just quoted from St Paul’s Epistle to the Colossians is surely this: You who have put on the profession of Christianity, and made a covenant with God, are told, that as Jesus Christ rose from the dead, you should rise to newness

of life. If ye be then risen with Christ, i. e. if you have set to work to fulfil your share of the covenant, so that you may lay claim, through the merits of Christ, to the rewards of which you are now only prospective heirs, you, I say, should shew your fulfilment of the covenant by having your affections on things in heaven, not on things of the earth. Now things in heaven are *spiritual* things; things on the earth are *carnal, fleeting, temporary*, having reference to bodily pleasures, and such like. Our affections and our seekings should be for the former, and not for the latter. It is natural to us in the uncovenanted state, and before we strive, by God's grace, to become new creatures; before we shew the development of the newly-implanted principle which, as Christians, we have all received; it is natural to us, each in his own different case, to set our affections, and make all our exertions, for carnal things, or things which have respect to this life only. Newness of life is shewn by a man's having experienced *a change* of purpose. Whereas in time past he lived engrossed by temporal matters, and was wholly absorbed, or mainly and chiefly occupied himself in those things which end here—as in acquirement of reputation, or honours, or riches, in the temporal advancement of his family, and in acquiring influence over his fellowmen: whereas in time past he made these things the chief or only objects of his energies:—now, in *newness* of life, they become only secondary objects, the

main, the chief, the absorbing cares of his life, are the ordering his own heart and mind, the seeking to be like unto Christ, the endeavour to subdue evil tendencies, and to cherish those dispositions of heart which we see exemplified in our Saviour's life. A strong desire to be conformed to that divine pattern will produce in us a striving to become holy, which God will bless with the assistance of His Divine Spirit, and so accomplish in the man the end to which he is striving to attain.

Formerly he might have thought it sufficient to refrain from speaking of his neighbour's conduct or affairs, because of the inconvenience resulting from indiscretion. *Now* he endeavours to check in his heart the disposition to criticise and find fault, because it is a law of Christianity, that we *think no evil* of each other. *Formerly* he might have toiled and laboured after riches, in order to improve his position in the world, in order to eclipse his neighbours, in order to have more means of gratifying his desires for vain pomps and amusements, in order to become powerful and respected, to be enabled to take a leading part. *Now* he cares very little about such things; he now strives to earn a competence for his family that they may be removed from the temptations of poverty; he strives to gain the affections and respect of his fellow-men in order that he may influence them for their own eternal good, and promote thereby the glory of God. *Now* his views, and objects, and aims, do not

centre in himself, or his own family, but he cares for the promotion of Christ's kingdom in the world, and strives by example, and by precept, to advance the reign of Christian holiness. *Formerly* he was charitable, as the world calls it, and *now* he may not be able to bestow so much perhaps. *Formerly* he may have had his name in every benevolent scheme, and *now* it may appear but seldom; but how changed may be the motive! He may have given to the poor, or the sick, in time past, without any sense of Christian duty, perhaps even to be seen of men, or to avoid importunity: *now*, he gives what he can (not what he can barely, out of his superfluity, but all that he can honestly, by self-sacrifice and self-denial), from love to Christ in every case. The poor are our brethren, for whom, as well as for us, Christ died; and we shew that we are his disciples, if we have love one to another. He gives *now* because he knows that God has entrusted him with riches in order to try whether he can be a faithful steward; and he strives so to acquit himself of the trust, that when he stands before his God, he may be called a 'good and faithful servant.' *Formerly*, he may have been restrained from malicious acts and wrathful passions, because of the discredit such dispositions meet with among men. *Now* he strives to put away malice out of his heart, because God looketh upon the motive and the disposition; because he weigheth the thoughts and the hearts of men.

In all this, you will observe, I have taken the case of a man whose outward demeanour shall not have changed, who *was* laborious in his calling, charitable to the poor, careful not to speak evil of others, watchful over angry passions, and who is *now* equally zealous in his profession, charitable in his actions and in his conversation, and even-tempered, the *same outwardly, but inwardly*, how *different!* In the one case merely thinking of the praise of men, in the other, seeking the honour that cometh from God only. The former man surely is so different from the latter, there has been such a change in his tendencies, in his real motives, and in the disposition of heart, that we may easily recognize how true the description given in the Gospel of such a change, when it is called *newness of life*. Of such an one, of a man who has so altered in disposition it is not hyperbolic language to use, when we say of him that he is ‘renewed in the spirit of his mind.’ I am not speaking of the *way* in which such a change is brought about, but I say that it is evident that we have a true description of such an altered man, in the words ‘transformed by the renewing of his mind;’ and when S. Paul tells us that ‘newness of life’ is the effect to be wrought in us by a proper appreciation of God’s mercies in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, is it not manifest that we must recognize this change in ourselves before we can thank God for that manifestation of his power and glory? ‘He died for all,’ says

the same apostle, 'that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature : old things are passed away ; behold, all things are become new.' OLD objects of desire, OLD motives to virtue, OLD feelings towards men and towards God, have all given way to NEW views of duty, NEW and more powerful incentives to exertion, NEW and more energetic efforts to fulfil our duty to God and man ; and this newness of our desires, newness of motive, newness of feeling, make up a new, entirely new, *disposition* of the whole man, and expressed in Scripture language, constitute that newness of life in which *we* should walk, even as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of God the Father.

We have thus endeavoured to fulfil the task to which we were to apply ourselves, viz. to enable each one to decide for himself, whether he is walking in newness of life. We have purposely not taken the case of a man who has indulged in coarse and vulgar sins, of one who has given a loose rein to the sinful propensities of our common nature, and yielded himself freely to the service of sin and Satan. In a Christian congregation it is not necessary for the preacher to shew how unconformable such a man is to the standard of Christian holiness. Those who do not check the bad propensities of their nature, who mortify none of their 'members which are upon the earth,' are not in danger of fancying

themselves *transformed* by the renewing of their minds, they have not a shadow of a pretence for believing that they are walking in newness of life; but it is the seeming wise, the outwardly virtuous, those who are noted for decency of deportment and general uniformity of respectable conduct, who are liable to deceive themselves; and this is why we have selected that case for illustration. ‘God looketh not upon the outward appearance,’ and therefore it is the duty of His messengers, narrowly and searchingly, to discriminate between the inward disposition and the outward appearance, that all the members of the flock may be enabled to judge *themselves*, in order that they be not hereafter judged of the Lord. Each one **MUST** judge *himself*. No other can look into our hearts. ‘No one knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him.’ It is the business of the preacher to declare generally what is laid down in holy Scripture, and to guard against the danger of self-deceit, as he knows it from his own heart. It is essential that we should all examine ourselves in this matter. If we find that the words which have been uttered come home to our hearts with any strong conviction, we shall have a practical assurance of the truth that the word of God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, because the storehouse from which the message is taken is His, Christ’s holy Gospel, that divine repository of searching and convincing truth which was given by inspiration of God; and we are in a position to

answer to our own consciences the question, Am I walking in newness of life? if not, have I not missed the great end of the design of God for my salvation in the Gospel? must I not set to work to secure my birthright which I have hitherto neglected?

If I have a good hope that I am walking in newness of life, how shall I shew forth my joy and gratitude to God?

Let us now endeavour to answer these questions, after taking warning of one danger in the self-examination which is thus urged upon us. Let not the inquiry into the fact of a change having taken place in our views, habits, and dispositions be thwarted by a desire to ascertain the manner or the time of the change. If we can now mark a difference, it is the work of God's holy Spirit, whenever or however it was wrought. In general, it is not a sudden matter. A man gradually becomes moulded to Christian principles. *Dispositions* can change only gradually. The first external motive may be disappointment or affliction, sickness, death of near relatives, God's word ministered in the Church, or private reading and study of that Book of Life. All these are means which God employs to awaken us to a true sense of our position, but the manner and the time are nothing, in comparison with the actual fact. Are we renewed, or are we not? According as we can answer this question on our death-beds must our eternal fate depend; and if we leave it till then unanswered, if we neglect the warning voice

that urges us now to self-examination, a gradual dimness and obscurity will grow over our mental vision, and we shall run the danger of losing the capability of reflection, or turning the attention inwards to the contemplation of our affections and internal disposition. Let us hear the warning words of S. Paul, 'Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith.' Are we walking in *newness of life*? If we miss the characteristics that have been given of the new life, the renovated mind, what can we say of ourselves? We cannot *rejoice* in the memory of Christ's resurrection, for in truth we shall have hitherto treated it as no concern at all of ours. We shall have merely acknowledged it as an historical fact, and shall have neglected the truth, that 'As he rose from the dead, so we should have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness.' How can we then rejoice this day? Oh, it is not indeed a day of rejoicing to us, if we remain unrenewed. Our certainty as to the fact of the resurrection cannot bring us joy; but, the melancholy truth must be told, to us it then brings nought but apprehension. The message that we must consider as delivered to us is the same that S. Paul delivered to the careless Athenians, 'God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.' And again to the Corinthians, 'He which raised up the Lord shall raise up us also by Jesus.'

The fact of our Lord's resurrection, this day set before our eyes, certifies to us the truth of a general judgment. It certifies to us the truth that we must all rise again, to receive in our bodies the due reward of our neglect or of our faith. We must appear before Him who 'is the Resurrection and the Life,' and we must be judged by the words of the text, 'As He rose from the dead, so should we have walked in newness of life.' And they, the thoughts of whose hearts sorrowfully acknowledge that they find nothing in their characters which can answer to newness of life, what shall they then say? Who will be their advocate then? When the renewed in heart and mind scarcely, with difficulty as it were, pass through that terrible ordeal, what will be their case, if that day find them, as now, unprepared? Will not these their desecrated Easter Festivals rise up against them and condemn them, because they approached God with hypocritical or careless words, and professed a joy which they did not feel, and joined in an exultation to which they were utter strangers?

The Resurrection of the Body then should fill us with apprehension lest we should stand speechless, and without an advocate, and hemmed in by witnesses of our own household, at the tribunal of this unavoidable, unalterable, unerring judgment. And this is *all* that the unrenovated can gather from the commemoration of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. It does not tell them of the redemption of the body from sin, and from

weakness, but it urges them with the overwhelming consciousness of penalties to be paid for neglect of the high things of God's merciful covenant.

If we are yet unconscious of the change from sin to righteousness, let not this day pass away without a strenuous endeavour to return and repent; let not the reproofs of God's Spirit die away on our ears and sink into forgetfulness, but let us pray to God earnestly to give us of his Spirit in larger measure, that our faith in the truths of the Gospel may grow up into a living principle within us, and work in us that change which is indispensable, if we would celebrate next Easter with honest, sincere, and heartfelt joy.

Let me, in conclusion, address but a few words to those who hope to recognize in themselves the newness of life of which S. Paul speaks. Brethren, you may not, perhaps, find within that sweetness of temper, and amiability of disposition, that you think should be found in those who dare to hope that they are faintly endeavouring to imitate the example of the Holy Jesus. You may tremble, as you venture to rank yourselves among those who can rejoice at Easter because the words of S. Paul are not strange to them. But though it is right to be diffident, and careful, and very cautious before we comfort ourselves with the hope of being in the way of Christ's sincere disciples, yet let not your hopes be faint, so as to deprive you of the great consolation which they may bring, *if* well founded.

It is not of your feelings that you are to judge, but the habitual frame of mind. What are your desires, first of all? Are they for things above, not for the things of the earth? Are you so desirous of the happiness of heaven that you strive to fit yourself for it, by forming those dispositions and cherishing those affections only which can be exercised in heaven? This is the state to which we must continually approximate, which we must have in view. And as we approach nearer and nearer to it, our happiness will more and more increase on earth, we shall care less and less for the crosses and vexations we may meet with, we shall care less and less for the pleasures that temporal things can bring, and we shall realize that truth which was read to us in the Epistle, '*Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.*'

Its meaning surely is this: If life consists in mere animal existence, taking no thought for the future, caring only for things apprehended by the bodily senses, then Christians are dead, they live not such a life; their life is one which is Spiritual, which is directed to the Eternal, which is occupied in the things of *God*, of *Christ*, of *heaven*. Their hearts are not influenced, so as to be guided by sublunary motives, the chamber is lighted from above, not from below. The light that guides them is not the fitful glare of terrestrial fires, but that which is shed by rays from the Sun of Righteousness. They are but sojourners on Earth, being really citizens of Heaven. They are looking to it as their home, when they shall be called away by

God's summons. The life they now live is only really life to them as far as it is by faith in the Son of God, and when harassed by cares and errors and carnal tendencies, they can exclaim with S. Paul, 'Who shall deliver me from this body of Death?' And like him remember in their hour of peril and weariness, 'I thank God, it shall be through Jesus Christ our Lord.' When we attain to this, we shall gratefully recall the fact that Christ is our Life, as well as the Resurrection from the dead; that He who promises to us eternal life, Himself, this day, gave proof of His omnipotence by resuming the life He had voluntarily laid down, and in *the power of an endless life*, He now sits at the right-hand of God to dispense, as an Almighty Sovereign, those blessings which He promised when He walked the earth in humility and poverty. Triumphant, therefore, in the solemn assurance of His ability and His willingness to impart spiritual life, may we all be brought to join honestly and heartily in praising the Eternal Father for the glorious resurrection of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sins of the world; who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored us to Everlasting Life.

INDIFFERENCE TO THE WORLD NOT ANY HINDERANCE
TO ACTIVE EXERTION.

S. MATTHEW VI. 33.

*Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness;
and all these things shall be added unto you.*

IN this chapter of S. Matthew's Gospel our Lord asserts that the thorough devotion of his disciples to the service of God is absolutely and indispensably necessary. 'No man can serve two masters.' 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' And the reasonableness of this assertion is very manifest; for since the service of God demands our whole strength, and soul, and mind, it leaves no room for any conclusion that part can be reserved for another master. All our faculties must be dedicated to God, in order that we may serve Him worthily; there can therefore be none left for the service of the world.

From this immediately follows the practical lesson, 'Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on,' i. e. we are not to be over anxious and over careful about all these things—they are not to occupy our energies—no pains or anxieties should be wasted upon them; for it is clear that if our powers of body or mind are overtasked in these their occasional exercise, they will

be unfit for their higher and more necessary work, the service of God.

In truth, he who looks on the future in its true light, who appreciates as he ought the momentous interests of eternity, ceases to care much about things present; these things fall to their true level in his estimation; and as his nature becomes sanctified and elevated by the continual influences of the Spirit shed abroad in his heart, things temporal become more and more indifferent. He is content to take what comes to his hand without murmurs, or too much elation. If prosperous, he is not much excited; if things are adverse, he is not over-anxious, they move him not much. As he looks to his home far away in the heavens, and refers to that great end all his cares and labours, he can think anxiously only on his own progress towards that blessed consummation; he thinks of his kindred and friends and those under his charge as journeying with him towards a state of being whose never-ending condition is alone worthy of anxious, deep, and constant care: the service of mammon will sound strange to him; the world's language and mode of thought he will have unlearned, and he is becoming, in real truth, daily, by the Spirit's influence, a citizen of heaven.

Yet, on the other hand, Christianity encourages no spirit of mystic absorption of the faculties. We are in a state of temptation; *in* the world, while we are to strive to live above it. Christianity does not command a man to be improvident, or careless, or

neglectful of any of the common duties. The Christian has cares, which he is to cast upon the Lord in prayer and faith, and so find relief; still he must have cares, and these are not only, though they are chiefly, spiritual; they do not only consist of grief at his own shortcomings, the bitter lessons learnt on the examination of his spiritual state, his want of love to God, his misspent time, his waste of precious opportunities, his unguarded words, the successful inroads of Satan upon his soul;—these are not the only, though they should be the bitterest cares of the Christian. Cares for his spiritual state, which affect his celestial citizenship,—these must be the heaviest cares which beset him, and which weigh down his spirit in repentance, till God mercifully reassures him with the sense of pardon, and so refreshes him in his progress through life. Beyond all this, however, there are cares, cares of this life, cares arising from the system under which God's providence has placed him. Self-examination should be not only in our duty to God, but duty to our neighbour. The improvident and careless man defrauds his neighbour. If, while he makes a profession of religion, he neglects to provide for his own, he throws a burden on his friends, or on his country; and has left unfulfilled the first duty that he owes to society. And he also in this sins against God, for he causes his good to be evil spoken of. We are all to labour for our daily bread in some way. It is the law of God pronounced upon all

mankind, after the fall, that they shall by the sweat of their brow earn their daily sustenance; and though in progress of time, and by the subdivision of labour, the consequence of human society, all men have not literally to till the ground, to draw therefrom their food, yet we must all do something or other for those who go through that manual labour for us. We have only re-divided labour; we have not, and never can, get rid of the law imposed upon us by God. We must all fulfil certain duties corresponding to our different stations. And when, therefore, we read that we must ‘take no thought for the morrow,’ and such admonitions of our Lord, we must remember that it is the Author of Nature, who is also the Founder of the Kingdom of Grace, and He must therefore speak in a way which is to be understood in reference to existing circumstances, and that the true and obvious meaning of such sentences is to be found by comparing them with the whole of His teaching, and endeavouring to understand the spirit of Christianity, in order to appropriate its main and leading idea as the great scheme of salvation.

All our faculties are due to God, all should be exercised in his service; the world can only claim a secondary part of our energies, it must not be our master. ‘One is our Master, even Christ.’ In all worldly matters then we cannot shew that extreme anxiety and earnestness that we should manifest in spiritual matters. It has been truly remarked that the word which we translate ‘care,’ ‘thought,’

means 'anxious care;' it expresses something more than we ordinarily express by the word care, and it is important to understand this aright. The words of our Lord mean what has been already stated—that absorbing attention, distracting care, for things temporal, shews us not to be acting on those principles which guide men who embrace heartily true Christian faith and hope.

Christians who would realize in their own lives the faith of Christ, must not be over anxious and careful about things temporal. 'By the cross of Christ,' says S. Paul, 'the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' That is, the amazing price paid for redemption so convinces my believing heart of the vanity of the present temporal life, that I cease to care at all about the world; the world is dead to me and I to it; and it is this new life, the new creation wherein a man lives unto Christ, and is dead to the world, that avails, and shews the power of Christianity. 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.' The new regenerate state, wherein heaven is all and earth as nothing, is what shews the power of the Gospel; and in proportion as a man can learn to look with indifference on the temporal present, with eagerness on the spiritual future, so may he measure his progress towards the attainment of final salvation.

Now these things are said to be foolishness unto the natural man. The man who follows the light of his own reason only, unassisted by the torch

of revelation which lights up the dark chambers of his intellect, would say thus: 'God has placed me in the world, and therefore my duty is to devote myself to those calls on my faculties which the world makes, and therefore I must strive by all means to get rich, become powerful, to shew what can be done by industry and perseverance, that thus I may, by my example, urge men on to a happy and comfortable state of existence here.' But even if we had not to live for the future, as well as the present, it might be shewn clearly that such an estimate of man's happiness is a false one. For in this world there are anomalies; and difficulties, sickness, misfortune, calamity, do not fall only on the indolent and careless, but also on the prudent. As the system of moral government is not complete in life present, therefore virtue is not always rewarded nor vice punished. This leads the reflecting to the question of the future state, and then Divine Revelation comes in, telling us plainly and clearly we are to live for the future mainly and chiefly; and it follows as a matter of course, that the main and chief employment of our faculties cannot be that which relates only to the present world and terminates in it.

Because it is, no doubt, hard to realize all this, Christianity is represented as a struggle, and the Holy Spirit dwells within us to strive against our natural tendencies, in order that we may not fulfil the natural desires of the flesh and of the mind. And to help us in this case, to convince

us of the needlessness of our anxious cares about temporal matters, to lift us out of the world of sense into the world of faith, our merciful Saviour, ever ready to lighten our burdens and remove our stumblingblocks, shews us, by His reasoning on the general superintending providence of God, that clearly on every view of the subject that common sense and daily observation supply, we ought not to be worried and tormented by fears of the want of daily food and raiment. 'If,' saith He, 'God clothes the grass of the field' with such beauty, if He cares for the unreasoning animals and feeds them, filling all things living with plenteousness,—if you will allow that the eyes of all wait upon the Lord, who giveth them their meat in due season, in the words of the Psalmist who addresses God in the 104th Psalm, 'These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them meat in due season. When thou givest it them they gather it, and when thou openest thine hand they are filled with good. When thou hidest thy face they are troubled. When thou takest away their breath they die, and are turned again to their dust. When thou lettest thy breath go forth they shall be made, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth:—if *all* things thus depend upon God, to whom should we go for the certainty of finding that which our soul and our body require?

Surely, the words of the text come home to us with an irresistible power of truth: 'Seek ye first

the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.'

All that we have real need of will God give us, if we seek Him first; and He may do this in two ways:—

He may either pour upon us the riches of His goodness, and so furnish us with the good things of this life, that, like some of old, we may become monuments to posterity of His unfailing and untiring benevolence:—

Or He may remove from us desires for the abundance of the things of this life, and give us a spirit of contentment with the plainest and simplest lot:—

And thus promote happiness in either case: but such is the weakness of man's nature, his want of firmness, and his sinful tendency, that the first method too generally ends ill for his spiritual state¹.

The wise king of Israel, whose name has passed into a proverb throughout the nations, was an example of a man on whom God had poured forth the richest treasures of the earth. In all things temporal he was blessed in a marvellous manner.

A powerful king, at peace with all the world, his treasury overflowing with riches, his people teeming in singular multitude, with splendid armies, and a navy which was the wonder of the

¹ Ταπεινοτέρων ὁ λογισμὸς ἴσως, ἀλλ' οὖν ἀσφαλεστέρων ἴσον ἀπέχειν καὶ ὕψους καὶ πτώματος. *Gregory Nazianz. Apol. 3.* quoted by *Hooker, Eccles. Polity, Book v. lxxvi. 5.*

time ; moreover one who was skilled in all knowledge and in all mysteries ; Solomon presented to the world an instance of what great things God can do for the sons of men. But what was the consequence ? we know that he fell away from God, that in his prosperity he forgot the Giver of all good, and fell into idolatry ; and Holy Scripture does not tell us whether his apostasy was final or not.

Surely, when Christ tells us that God the Father will give us all temporal good, if we seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,—and we see in the verses preceding the name of *Solomon*, which seems purposely brought in to remind us of his singular case, and the fearful sin into which he fell when fulfilled with God's bountiful gifts,—we should think within ourselves whether we cannot see in the Christian mode of making men happy there is not greater safety than in the old method under the Jewish covenant. Temporal riches are so apt to make us forget God, and miss our everlasting salvation, that the experience of ages shews, the best method of preserving us to the day of the Lord, is the *new creation*—a change in our desires, in our fears, in our hopes. And all things that are needful and pleasant are added to us under the Gospel, by the working of the Spirit within us, which destroys our love of things carnal, makes us care but little for labour and toil, makes us set our hopes on the enduring and solid rewards of heaven, and not on the perishing, vain, and empty joys of

earth¹. ‘Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.’

Riches you may not have, in gold, and silver, and precious stones, it may be, but you shall feel as contented with your lot as if you dwelt in a royal palace.

Not clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day, but rejoicing in your indifference to such things, and feeling that you really do not care for such distinctions, do not wish to pamper the appetite.

This spirit of contentment S. Paul refers to as the fulfilment of the promise of our Saviour when he says to Timothy, ‘Godliness with contentment is great gain: we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out; and having food and raiment, let us be therewith content.’

We have daily examples of the truth that possessions of vast extent are insufficient for men’s happiness, unless there is something more *within*. The noble and powerful in our own land are not secure—the accumulations of ages in riches of all kinds have been scattered in a few days—the princely domain, and lands added to lands, may be broken up, and leave nothing but a disgraced

¹ *Credenti totus mundus divitiarum est. Infidelis etiam obolo indiget. Sic vivamus, tanquam nihil habentes, et omnia possidentes. Victus et vestitus divitiæ Christianorum. Si habes in potestate rem tuam, vende: si non habes, projice. Facile contemnit omnia, qui se semper cogitat esse moriturum.—S. Hieronymi Epistolæ, Lib. II. Ep. 2. (Ed. Canisii. 1581.)*

name to their former owner. It is impossible not to draw the conclusion that urges itself upon us from these considerations, viz. that in religion alone is real happiness—that the regulation of our affections and our faculties is that which will secure us true contentment; and when we are fully convinced of this from these reflections which our Lord's Sermon in the Gospel gives rise to, we can turn to other passages which tell us, that it is by the Cross of Christ that we must be crucified to the world, and the world unto us—that under the new covenant it is the renovation of man by the influence of the Holy Ghost, which alone avails anything—and that peace and mercy shall be on such as walk according to this rule.

Now it may seem not to be a strict fulfilment of the promise, that this change of desires should be meant; but if we look to the effect produced rather than to the means, we shall become convinced that there is nothing but what is agreeable to God's laws. If the state of happiness means a state in which the desires are fully satisfied, it is clear that the result is secured by the abatement of the desire quite as much as by repletion. The constant seeking for something which we cannot attain, while we yet believe it to be within our reach, may be removed; and thus happiness may be secured, as much as by granting the fulfilment of desires. The aeronaut increases his buoyancy by casting out the ballast, and the heart of the Christian is lightened and gladdened by the rooting out

of desires for earthly delights. He ascends to the state of freedom and happiness by parting with his earthly and downward tendencies and wishes.

We cannot interpret the present passage as we should those promises which our Lord makes on another occasion : ‘ Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name’s sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.’ This may be understood of the universal brotherhood of Christians ; and little as it may seem verified at present, yet in the first ages of Christianity, we know from the Divine Record, that it was fulfilled by the disciples having all things common, and finding in the bonds of Christian fellowship an abundant return for the ties which they severed when joining the new religion. But, in the present instance, it is in reference to the ordinary wants of mankind that our Lord is speaking, and specially of anxiety about more than the bare necessities of life. For, that we are to pray to our Father in heaven that He would satisfy our *daily* wants, we learn from the Lord’s prayer. If then all our anxiety and earnestness be for spiritual gifts, for progress in righteousness, we shall have all other things added unto us, i. e. we shall be satisfied. In this sense S. Paul had the promise fulfilled to him ; he had learned in whatever state he was therewith to be content ; and his contentment was not produced by the gratification of desires, but by their abatement. His language is

the expression of one whose desires for earthly comforts and luxuries, earthly power and station, had passed away; and in respect of them he may be said to have been gratified, and to have received what he desired. Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all your remaining desires (which in that case will be moderate) shall be abundantly gratified.

The distinguishing mark of a Christian is moderation¹, σωφροσύνη², an indifference to those things after which men naturally strive: the comforts, and elegancies, and luxuries of life, ought not to be primary objects of desire. The Christian ought to be content to go without them—to be ready to resign these things—to set lightly by them; according to that saying of our Lord, ‘Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.’ We have no more reason to take such words literally than we have to take literally the sayings about smiting on the cheek, or forcible abstraction of the cloak. It is clear that these precepts are the vivid expressions of the

¹ ἐπεὶ τάγ’ ἀρκούνθ’ ἱκανὰ τοῖς γε σώφροσιν. *Eur. Phœn.* 554.

² *Suidas.* σωφροσύνη λέγεται παρὰ τὸ σώας ἔχειν τὰς φρένας. *Aristotle. Ethic.* vi. 5, 5. Where *Muretus* in his note says: Ac præterea σωφροσύνην vocamus non tantum temperantiam verum etiam moderationem quandam animi, quæ constat ex cognitione sui et ex moderatione omnium affectuum. The government of the passions—rule over them—is the meaning which leads to the third use of the word mentioned in *Suicer’s Thesaurus, Castitas*. A man is σώφρων when he can restrain and moderate natural desires, as distinguished from one who is led by the passions.

same idea as forsaking all that a man hath—the idea, namely, of indifference to mere worldly good; and it is equally clear that this is the real test of Christianity in practice. What do we live for? this world or the next? If we live for this world, then we naturally are anxious about things present; we have no idea whatever of sacrificing comforts, or power, or wealth, or station, unless it be for some greater temporal good. These are the legitimate objects which absorb a man's energies who lives for life present; but if we live for the life to come, it is impossible that these things should be of primary importance to us. We cannot be much absorbed by them, when we know that they are soon to pass away, and that our real life is to begin when they fail.

Now in applying this to our own case, it may seem a very hard test to propose to judge of our spiritual state, i. e. of our hopes of heaven.

How few amongst us look upon the University as their home! How few intend to pass their lives here! The majority are looking forward to some earthly change as an important one; the younger amongst us are justly urged to bend their energies to immediate objects; and things temporal are essentially connected with their views and thoughts. Should we be doing right if we were to apply the warning of the text, so as to make them indifferent to the success or failure of their exertions in the University? Not at all. This is a danger to be guarded against in many who have serious impres-

sions. We should grossly err if we applied the admonition to be little careful for things of earth, so as to produce carelessness in the pursuits of the University. These are not like temporal gratifications, terminating in themselves. In as far as they are pursued merely with hopes of emolument they are purely earthly; and the eagerness displayed in their acquirement is not the offspring of Christian principle; but in proportion as there is mingled with this—desire for cultivating the talents bestowed upon us, and for improving ourselves as *men* in all noble intellectual qualities—diligence and eagerness in the pursuits of an academical career are proofs of our wish to approve ourselves before God, as His soldiers and servants, and as having a keen sense of responsibility for all the powers with which He has endowed us. We should not be seeking God and His righteousness, if we were to neglect the duties of this place, which all have for their ultimate object the benefit of those who are under instruction. For seeking God implies that we strive to be imitators like our Saviour Jesus Christ, and therefore that we endeavour in all things to do His will; and to do our duty in that position in which He has placed us now, requires that all our faculties be sharpened, and called into active exercise; that our memories be stored with the wisdom of the past, and that we be able to take the lead in this great nation with intelligence and aptitude, and well freighted with the lessons of prudence which the past history of

mankind can supply. The whole genius of our reformed institutions is against the notion of knowledge for a man's self, of the isolated treasuring up of information in ourselves. It is in favour of progress, the welfare of the many, extension of knowledge for the improvement moral and social of mankind, general education, the raising up of the lower and more neglected grades of society to a better position, the universal and constant amelioration of the state of all classes of men. These are the great and noble objects which the Christian patriot should have in view. To acquire knowledge for a man's self is a mean object compared with the desire to progress in all respects in order to impress upon others the results of our mental labour.

Viewed in this aspect, none can say that the duties of an academical residence are worldly, and therefore ought not to be primary objects of exertion. Our means of doing good depend much upon the estimation in which our brethren hold us. It is within the reach of all now to acquire a position which in the world at large will be in their favour. And though it may not be true that academical honours are a sure and certain index of future usefulness, yet if there be in any one a yearning for doing Christ's work, if he have a noble sense of duty, with sincere and honest desire to fulfil it, he will in most cases be gaining the attention of others, be securing an opening for exertions in more serious and important services, if he will now

endeavour, in the ability which God has given him, to labour heartily in the course set before him, to acquit himself manfully of the duties assigned to him by those whose directions he is bound to observe.

If he will thus labour honestly, then no doubt he will find the truth of the words of our Lord, whether he succeed here or not. If this settled sense of duty, if right principle have led him, then he will have been really seeking God first. And “then all other things shall be added unto him;” he will be made to feel that God’s work for him has to be yet pointed out; to go on in the higher path if he have already made good his standing on the arduous ascent, or to proceed in some other direction if he have not been so well approved in his first attempt. In either case, the conscientious Christian student will find the promise verified that “all other things shall be added unto him.’ We must strive to do the best we can. God will employ our energies for the best. A trial of our faith may perhaps be involved in this. We are constantly tempted to think that we are better fitted for some other work than that we are actually engaged in. But God knows best. We should always recollect that there may be propensities lurking within us, which in any other position than that we occupy would have proved fatal to our eternal happiness. Who can tell? Must not our Heavenly Father know full well what is our danger, and where we

are most useful? Again comes in the idea of our text, 'If we seek first God and His righteousness, all other things will be added unto us.' If our sole desire is to do our duty, and promote God's glory, following in the steps of our blessed Redeemer, then we shall not repine at a position being allotted to us different from that which we desire; we shall know that He ordereth all things as it seemeth Him best; and in this confidence we shall be persuaded that whatever is *really good* for us is *really* added to us.

Yet it is lamentably certain, that notwithstanding the admonitions of Holy Scripture men do not generally devote their best energies and first thoughts to the service of God. We rather set the world first. We give our chief energy to the accomplishment of worldly aims, and make God's service a secondary matter. Let any man reckon with himself how much time he gives to the consideration of his spiritual state, to anticipations of his destiny beyond the grave, to self-examination and prayer, and compare it with the hours he devotes to improvement of his means, to calculations and forming plans for the future of life present, to self-indulgence and indolence, and it will too generally be found that there is a marvellous disproportion between them. Have we then any right to find that Christian contentment abiding in us which is promised to those who seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness?

The case is similar to that of many of our students who come here with anticipations of success and honour, and then dwindle down into desultory idlers. To succeed, the goal must be kept constantly in view. It must be uppermost in the thoughts, it must be the first thing sought; and in proportion as any one does this, is self-approval just, and a source of satisfaction; but if it be not first, if pleasure and sloth be preferred, if exertions are feeble, and labour intermitted, the prize recedes from the view, and discontent and despondency take the place of contentment. Learning, to be acquired, must be followed after and ensued as the first thing. If any other pursuit engross the affections, failure is certain, and dissatisfaction must follow.

Again, it is easy to see how one characteristic of the Christian course leads directly to the result which we have said is intended in the promise, 'All these things shall be added unto you.' *Self-denial* is the practical lesson of Christianity which it costs us most to learn; but when learnt, it plainly leads us to be content with such things as we have. Self-denial—the taking up the Cross—this it is which stops men. This is the deep gulf to be passed, in which many make shipwreck; and yet how marvellous it is, that for worldly objects men do not repine at the severest of dangers and difficulties.

At the present time¹ we see kindled in most

¹ *October, 1854.*

men some enthusiasm and sympathy when they read of the heroic deeds of valour which those of our own blood are now exhibiting. The feats of manly courage, and the patient endurance of privations, stir in us also a boldness of spirit; and we see no inconsistency in this generous self-devotion between the sacrifices and the object for which they are made. Long may it be so—long may the principle of *duty* to the Queen and country dwell in the heart of every Englishman. But how strangely at fault are these principles and feelings when we transfer the case to matters moral and spiritual. We have a King to whom our allegiance is due, whose sworn subjects we are, and we are now engaged on His behalf to do battle to the powers of evil in every shape, without and within. Alas! how is the principle of duty *here* wanting. To put the two cases in contrast seems strange, so little do men feel it to be necessary to shew activity, earnestness, and enthusiasm, in the service of their Lord in heaven.

Yet, seeking the kingdom of God and His righteousness is not a matter of indolent unconcern. Unless we really are vigorous in spiritual action, we cannot be doing any effective work. Oh let us strive earnestly to secure the true and great reward. I feel that in urging self-denial my voice must be feeble. In calling men to be strenuously active on Christ's behalf, I have no heroic example to shew; but I cannot avoid reminding

you that you are soon to be addressed from this place by one who *has* given up all for Christ's sake¹, whose admonitions will come upon you with all the force of consistent example and noble self-devotion. May God of His mercy grant that these words spoken in feebleness may be ratified; that the message of salvation, the warning of self-denial, may be imprinted deeply on the hearts of all. And we have this comforting reflection, that in all cases it is of God's gift that the increase comes; the message is not dependent for its success on our imperfect exertions. 'My word, saith the Lord, shall not return unto me void; it shall accomplish the end whereto I send it.'

Seek *first* the kingdom of God. When the end is come, it must be the *last* thing that you think of. If we have climbed vigorously up the hill of God, then when we enter the narrow defile that separates us from the promised land, we may perceive the landscape overspread with mist, and indistinct; we shall from the mountain-top gaze with confident expectation on that which we may not yet see in all its grandeur and sublimity. But in the morning of the resurrection, when the Sun of righteousness shall arise in the fulness of his strength, and the mist shall roll away in glorious majesty, our longing eyes shall be satisfied with a full revelation of that kingdom of God which we

¹ The University Preacher for the month following that in which these Lectures were delivered was the *Bishop of New Zealand*.

have sought with earnest self-devotion. And the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him, though hitherto unseen, shall be perceived—though hitherto unheard, shall be clearly distinguished.

But if we will not seek *first* the kingdom of God now, if we travel onwards in indolent security, along the beaten and easy track, the everlasting hills shall separate us from the brilliant scenes in which we might have taken part, and the ever-descending road into the valley of the shadow of death takes us far away from the land of the blessed. ‘And they shall pass through,’ saith the prophet, ‘hardly bestead and hungry; and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry and faint, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward.’ ‘And they shall look unto the earth; and behold trouble, and darkness, dimness of anguish; and the light is darkened in the heavens thereof.’

And how bitter *then* to think of our neglected Saviour, to think how we have carelessly disregarded the love of One so mighty and so merciful, how we have turned away from the affectionate entreaties of One so anxious to save us, so sympathising, so deeply concerned in our welfare. How terrible to think of the requital of our obstinacy, when Jesus, the kind, the merciful, the compassionate, is to be the Just Judge, and we are anxious to hide ourselves from the face of Him that

sitteth on the throne, and from the *wrath of the Lamb*.

Oh! listen to the voice of wisdom. Seek first the bread of life which came down from heaven. Temporal wants are less than nothing compared with spiritual. We have within us a deep desire for immortality, and it is only he that eateth of this bread that shall live for ever.

CAMBRIDGE :
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

JANUARY, 1855.

NEW BOOKS

IN THE COURSE OF PUBLICATION

BY

MESSRS. RIVINGTON,

WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL, LONDON.

I.

EVANGELICAL LIFE, as seen in the EXAMPLE of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. By JOHN JAMES, D.D., Canon of Peterborough, Author of a "Comment on the Collects," and other Works. In 12mo. 7s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

II.

CHRISTIANITY and MODERN INFIDELITY: their relative INTELLECTUAL CLAIMS compared. By the Rev. R. W. MORGAN, Perpetual Curate of Tregynon, Montgomeryshire; Author of "Verities of the Christian Church," "Vindication of the Church of England," and other Works. In post 8vo. 8s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

III.

QUEBEC CHAPEL SERMONS, preached in the former Half of 1854. By HENRY ALFORD, B.D., Minister of the Chapel; Editor of a New Edition of the Greek Testament, with English Notes. In small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The SECOND SERIES, (completing the Year,) is in the press.

IV.

CHRISTIAN SEASONS; a Series of Poems. By the AUTHOR of "The CATHEDRAL." *Contents*:—Advent—Christmas—Lent—Easter—Whitsuntide—and Allhallowtide. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

V.

OCCASIONAL SERMONS, preached in Westminster Abbey. FIFTH SERIES. (On RELIGIOUS RESTORATION in ENGLAND.) By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster.

Contents:—On National Sins, Judgments, and Duties.—Census of Religious Worship.—The Episcopate; and on Additional Sees.—The Diaconate; and on Lay Agency.—Tithes, Endowments, and Maintenance of the Clergy.—On Church Rates.—On Divorce.—Restoration of Holy Matrimony.—Hopes of Religious Restoration. In 8vo. 8s.

VI.

MORNING NOTES of PRAISE, a Series of MEDITATIONS upon the MORNING PSALMS. By LADY CHARLOTTE-MARIA PEPYS. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

VII.

QUIET MOMENTS; a FOUR WEEKS' COURSE of MEDITATIONS before Evening Prayer; and for Noonday and Sunset. By the SAME AUTHORESS. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

VIII.

ENGLAND'S SACRED SYNODS; a CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY of the CONVOCATIONS: showing the primitive Source and British Origin of these Assemblies, and tracing their Records from the Earliest Times to the Date of the Establishment of the Book of Common Prayer. By JAMES WAYLAND JOYCE, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, Rector of Burford, Third Portion, and Proctor for the Clergy of the Diocese of Hereford. In One Volume. 8vo. (*In the press.*)

IX.

ENGLAND and ROME; a Discussion of the PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES and PASSAGES of HISTORY in common Debate between the Members of the two COMMUNIONS. By W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. In 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

X.

PAPERS and SERMONS on the WAR. In the course of publication, a Series of Religious Papers for the Seat of War and the Relations at Home; intended to meet the cases of the Wounded, the Dying, the Prisoner, the Relation at Home, the Recruit, and the Public.

MANUAL of PRAYER for the WOUNDED. 9d. (*Ready.*)

- Jan. 1.—SERMON for the WOUNDED.
 „ 8.—To the DYING.
 „ 15.—To the MOTHER at HOME.
 „ 22.—To the RECRUIT.
 „ 31.—The DUTY of the BRITISH PUBLIC.

XI.

The **SECOND GERMAN BOOK: a SYNTAX, and Etymological Vocabulary, with copious Reading-Lessons and Exercises.** By the late Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and J. W. FRÄDERSDORFF, Phil. Dr., of the Taylor-Institute, Oxford. In 12mo. 6s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

Also, by the same Authors,

1. The **FIRST GERMAN BOOK.** *Third Edition.* 5s. 6d.
2. **READING COMPANION** to the **FIRST GERMAN BOOK.** 4s.
3. **HANDBOOK of GERMAN VOCABULARY.** 4s.

XII.

The **GREEK TESTAMENT: with a Critically revised Text; Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a CRITICAL and EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY** in English. By the Rev. HENRY ALFORD, B.D., Minister of Quebec Chapel, London, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. VOL. I. *Second Edition.* In 8vo.

Lately published,

The **SECOND VOLUME.** (The Third and Concluding Volume is in preparation.)

XIII.

THE MESSIAH, Theologically and Practically Contemplated, in His Person, Work, and Kingdom. By WILLIAM BROWN GALLOWAY, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mark's, Regent's Park, St. Pancras. In 8vo. 9s. (*Now Ready.*)

XIV.

ARNOLD'S SCHOOL CLASSICS.—HORATHI OPERA, followed by ENGLISH INTRODUCTIONS and NOTES.

This Edition of Horace is based upon that of Dr. DÜBNER, but the Introductions and Notes have been abridged, and in many places re-written, and additional Notes introduced, and pains taken to adapt the Commentary more especially to the use of Schools. In 12mo. 7s. (*Just published.*)

XV.

The INSPIRATION of HOLY SCRIPTURE, its Nature and Proof; Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By WILLIAM LEE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. In 8vo. 14s.

XVI.

A CATECHETICAL HELP to BISHOP BUTLER'S ANALOGY. By the Rev. CAMPBELL GREY HULTON, M.A., of Brazenose College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

XVII.

PREPARATION of PROPHECY; or, the Use and Design of the OLD TESTAMENT Examined. By WILLIAM ROWE LYALL, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. *New and Improved Edition.* In 8vo. 9s.

XVIII.

A PLAIN and SHORT HISTORY of ENGLAND for CHILDREN: in Letters from a Father to his Son. With Questions. By GEORGE DAVYS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. *Eleventh Edition.* In 18mo. 2s. 6d.

XIX.

NINE CHARGES delivered to the CLERGY of the DIOCESE of LINCOLN; with SOME OTHER WORKS. By JOHN KAYE, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln. Edited by his SON. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

XX.

A COURSE of SERMONS on the LORD'S PRAYER, with Illustrations from the Writings of the Fathers of the Church. By THOMAS HUGO, M.A., F.S.A., F.L.S., Senior Curate of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate. In 12mo. 6s.

XXI.

A MEMOIR of FELIX NEFF, Pastor of the High Alps; and of his Labours among the French Protestants of Dauphiné, a Remnant of the Primitive Christians of Gaul. By WILLIAM STEPHEN GILLY, D.D., Canon of Durham, and Vicar of Norham. *Sixth Edition.* In small 8vo. 5s. 6d. (*In the press.*)

XXII.

MEDITATIONS and PRAYERS on the ORDINATION SERVICE for DEACONS. By the Rev. J. H. PINDER, M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XXIII.

NOTES at PARIS in 1853; particularly on the State and Prospects of RELIGION. In small 8vo. 4s.

XXIV.

THE SECOND HEBREW BOOK, containing the BOOK of GENESIS. With Syntax and Vocabulary. By the late Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 9s.

Lately published, by the same Author,

The FIRST HEBREW BOOK. 12mo. 7s. 6d. (*A KEY to this Work is now ready, price 3s. 6d.*)

XXV.

AN INTRODUCTION to the DEVOTIONAL STUDY of the HOLY SCRIPTURES. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.C.L., Head Master of Rugby School, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XXVI.

THE JOURNAL of CONVOCATION, No. II., being a New Series of "SYNODALIA." Edited by the Rev. CHARLES WARREN, of Over, St. Ives, Hunts. In 8vo. 2s. (*Now ready.*)

Lately published, No. I., containing the REPORTS of CONVOCATION for 1854. 1s.

XXVII.

A PARAPHRASTIC TRANSLATION of the APOSTOLICAL EPISTLES, with NOTES. By the late PHILIP NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chichester. *Fifth Edition.* In 8vo. 9s.

XXVIII.

MATERIALS for TRANSLATION into LATIN: selected and arranged by AUGUSTUS GROTEFEND. Translated from the German by the Rev. H. H. ARNOLD, B.A., and Edited (with Notes and Excursuses from Grotefend) by the late Rev. T. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Third Edition.* In 8vo. 7s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

. A KEY to this Work may now be had. In 8vo. 4s.

XXIX.

THE HAPPINESS of the BLESSED Considered as to the Particulars of their State; their Recognition of each other in that State; and its Difference of Degrees. By RICHARD MANT, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. *Seventh Edition.* In 12mo. 4s.

XXX.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER; Six Sermons preached in LENT. By JOHN JACKSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. *Fifth Edition.* In small 8vo. 3s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

XXXI.

PRAYERS for the SICK and DYING. By the Author of "SICKNESS: its TRIALS and BLESSINGS." In 12mo. *Second Edition.* 2s. 6d.

XXXII.

SOME ACCOUNT of the COUNCIL of NICÆA, in connexion with the LIFE of ATHANASIUS. By JOHN KAYE, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln. In 8vo. 8s.

XXXIII.

HENRY'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR; a Manual for BEGINNERS. By the late Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 3s. 6d.

In this Work Mr. Arnold has applied the scientific method developed by Becker to the Syntax of the English language, and the beginner is introduced by a simple process of observation and analysis to this method as a groundwork of grammatical study.

XXXIV.

The SECOND EDITION of SERMONS on the HOLY DAYS observed in the CHURCH of ENGLAND throughout the Year. By the Rev. J. H. PINDER, M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College. In 12mo. 6s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author,

SERMONS on the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. *Third Edition.* 7s.

XXXV.

PARISH SERMONS, as preached from his own Pulpit. By the Rev. JAMES ASPINALL, M.A., Rector of Althorpe, Lincolnshire; Author of "Sermons Doctrinal and Practical," and other Works. In 12mo. 5s.

XXXVI.

A COURSE of SERMONS on the EPISTLE and GOSPEL for each Sunday in the Year. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and Author of a "Harmony of the Gospels, with Reflections." In 2 vols. small 8vo. 11s.

XXXVII.

THE FIRST ITALIAN BOOK; on the Plan of the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD'S FIRST FRENCH BOOK. By Signor PIFFERI, Professor of Italian, and DAWSON W. TURNER, M.A., Head Master of the Royal Institution School, Liverpool. In 12mo. 5s. 6d.

* * * A KEY to the EXERCISES may be had, price 1s. 6d.

XXXVIII.

CHRISTIAN LIFE: a MANUAL of SACRED VERSE. By ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Author of "The Omnipresence of the Deity." *Sixth Edition.* In 32mo. 4s.

XXXIX.

THE COLONIAL CHURCH CHRONICLE and MISSIONARY JOURNAL. VOL. VII. [July, 1853—June, 1854.]

In 8vo. 7s.

*** This JOURNAL contains numerous Original Articles, Correspondence, and Documents relating to the CHURCH in the COLONIES, Reviews and Notices of New Publications, and a Monthly Summary of Colonial, Foreign, and Home News.

Continued in Monthly Numbers, price 6d. each.

XL.

PRIVATE DEVOTIONS and FAMILY PRAYERS.

Edited by the Rev. EDWARD SCOBELL, M.A., Incumbent Minister of St. Peter's, Vere Street, St. Marylebone. In 18mo. 1s. 6d.

XLI.

ST. HIPPOLYTUS and the CHURCH of ROME in the Earlier Part of the THIRD CENTURY; from the newly-discovered "PHILOSOPHUMENA," or, the Greek Text of those Portions which relate to that subject; with an ENGLISH VERSION and NOTES; and an Introductory Enquiry into the Authorship of the Treatise, and on the Life and Works of the Writer. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. In 8vo. 8s. 6d.

XLII.

SEVEN SERMONS for a SICK ROOM. By the Rev. EDWARD BERENS, M.A., Archdeacon of Berks, and Vicar of Shrivenham. In 12mo. 1s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

XLIII.

RIDDLE and ARNOLD'S ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY for the Use of Schools: being an Abridgment of Riddle and Arnold's *Copious and Critical English-Latin Lexicon*, by the Rev. J. C. EBDEN, late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. In post 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

XLIV.

THINGS AFTER DEATH; containing Three Chapters on the INTERMEDIATE STATE, with Thoughts on Family Burying Places, and 150 ORIGINAL EPITAPHS in Verse, for Country Churchyards. By the Rev. JOHN MILLER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XLV.

XENOPHON'S ANABASIS. With ENGLISH NOTES, translated (with Additions) from the German of Dr. HERTLEIN, by the late Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A., Canon of Chichester. (Forming a New Volume of *Arnold's School Classics.*) In 12mo. 6s. 6d.

Books IV. to VII. of this Edition are contained in Mr. Arnold's *Fourth Greek Book.*

XLVI.

SICKNESS: its TRIALS and BLESSINGS. *Fourth Edition.* In small 8vo. 5s.

XLVII.

HYMNS and POEMS for the SICK and SUFFERING.

In connexion with the Service for the VISITATION of the SICK.
 Edited by the Rev. T. V. FOSBERY, M.A., Perpetual Curate of
 Sunningdale. *Third Edition.* In small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

This Volume contains 233 separate pieces; of which about 90 are by writers who lived prior to the 18th Century: the rest are modern, and some of these original. Amongst the names of the writers (between 70 and 80 in number) occur those of Sir J. Beaumont—Sir T. Browne—F. Davison—Elizabeth of Bohemia—P. Fletcher—G. Herbert—Dean Hicke—Bp. Ken—Norris—Quarles—Sandys—Bp. J. Taylor—Henry Vaughan—and Sir H. Wotton. And of modern writers:—Miss E. B. Barrett—The Bishop of Oxford—S. T. Coleridge—Sir R. Grant—Miss E. Taylor—W. Wordsworth—Rev. Messrs. Chandler—Keble—Lyte—Monseil—Moultrie—and Trench.

XLVIII.

SERMONS preached at Romsey. By the Hon. and Rev. GERARD J. NOEL, M.A., late Canon of Winchester, and Vicar of Romsey, Hants. With a Preface by SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford. In 12mo. 7s. 6d.

XLIX.

A NEW TRANSLATION of the RECEIVED TEXT of the APOSTOLICAL EPISTLES, slightly interpolated, and illustrated by a Synoptical and Logical Paraphrase of the Contents of each: the whole setting forth the sum of an Ancillary Series of Annotations on the Epistles. By THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, D.D., Head Master of Repton School; and some time Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. PART I.—ROMANS. In 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author, just published,

ANNOTATIONS on ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS.
Second Edition, revised and enlarged. In 8vo. 7s. 6d.

L.

THE THIRD GREEK BOOK; containing a Selection from XENOPHON'S CYROPÆDIA, with Explanatory Notes, Syntax, and a Glossarial Index. By the late Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 3s. 6d.

LI.

THE FOURTH GREEK BOOK; or, the Last Four Books of XENOPHON'S ANABASIS, containing the HISTORY of the RETREAT of the TEN THOUSAND GREEKS: with Explanatory Notes, and Grammatical References. By the SAME EDITOR. In 12mo. 4s.

LII.

THE SECOND ADAM: a COURSE of LECTURES on the DIVINITY of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the Union of the Divine and Human Natures in his Sacred Person; (with certain OCCASIONAL SERMONS.) Delivered in St. John's Church, Cheltenham. By WILLIAM JOHN EDGE, M.A., formerly Rector of Waldringfield, Suffolk. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LIII.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION, Part the First. By the late Rev. THOMAS KER-CHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 8vo. 5s. 6d. *Eighth Edition.*

* * * This new Edition has been reprinted from the *Sixth* in deference to opinions of authority as to the comparative usefulness of the *Sixth* and *Seventh*, and will remain in future the standard Edition.

The object of this Work is to enable the Student, as soon as he can decline and conjugate with tolerable facility, to translate simple sentences after given examples, and with given words; the principles trusted to being principally those of *imitation and very frequent repetition.* It is at once a Syntax, a Vocabulary, and an Exercise Book; and is used at all, or nearly all, the Public Schools.

Also, by the same Author,

A SECOND PART of the above Work (On the PARTICLES). In 8vo. 6s. 6d.

LIV.

THE DARK AGES; a Series of Essays in illustration of the Religion and Literature of the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries. By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S., and F.S.A., some time Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. *Third Edition.* In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LV.

ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY: or, LIVES of EMINENT MEN connected with the HISTORY of RELIGION in ENGLAND, from the commencement of the REFORMATION to the REVOLUTION. Selected, and Illustrated with NOTES. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., late Rector of Buxted with Uckfield, Sussex, and Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Fourth Edition.* In 4 vols. 8vo. *With 5 Portraits.* 2l. 14s.

Also, by the same Editor (uniformly printed),

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTES: A Series of DISCOURSES and TRACTS, selected, arranged systematically, and illustrated with NOTES. *Second Edition.* In 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 14s.

LVI.

THE FIFTH EDITION of LECTURES, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, and PRACTICAL, on the CATECHISM of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. By FRANCIS-RUSSELL NIXON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Tasmania. In 8vo. 16s.

LVII.

CORNELIUS TACITUS, PART II. (ANNALES, Books XI.—XVI.) With ENGLISH NOTES, translated from the German of Dr. KARL NIPPERDEY, with additions, by the Rev. H. BROWNE, M.A., Canon of Chichester. (Forming a New Volume of the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD'S CLASSICS.) In 12mo. 5s.

Also,

PART I. containing the First Six Books of the ANNALES. 6s.

RECENT PAMPHLETS AND TRACTS.

I.

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's. By CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D., Bishop of St. David's, at his Fifth Visitation, in September and October, 1854. In 8vo. 2s.

II.

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Worcester, at his Triennial Visitation, July, 1854; containing Strictures on Archdeacon Wilberforce's Treatise on the Eucharist. By HENRY, Lord Bishop of Worcester. In 8vo. 1s.

III.

A CHARGE to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, at his Visitation in August and September, 1854. By JAMES-HENRY, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. In 8vo.

IV.

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne, in July, 1854. By R. C. COXE, M.A., Archdeacon. In 8vo. 1s.

V.

A CHARGE delivered at the Spring Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Lincoln, in May, 1854. By H. K. BONNEY, D.D., Archdeacon of Lincoln. In 8vo. 4*l*.

VI.

"THE CHURCH RATE QUESTION AND THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN IT;" a CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone, at the Ordinary Visitation, in May, 1854. By BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone. In 8vo. 1s.

VII.

LAY of the CRIMEA. Canto I. By JOHN DRYDEN PIGOTT, Author of "The Patriarch of the Nile," "Egypt," &c. 1s.

VIII.

SOME ACCOUNT of the CANTERBURY SETTLEMENT, New Zealand, 1853. By the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A., Commissary of the Bishop of New Zealand, and late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. In 18mo. 1s.

IX.

A SERMON; preached at Christ Church, before his Honour the Superintendent and the Provincial Council of Canterbury, New Zealand, at the Opening of their First Session, on Tuesday, September 27, 1853. By the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A., Commissary of the Bishop of New Zealand, and formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 6*l*.

X.

THE DOCTRINE of the CHURCH not to be proscribed in her Normal Schools; the JUDGMENT of the ARCHBISHOP of YORK, and the BISHOP of RIPON upon alleged erroneous Teaching in the Training School at YORK; also the STATEMENT of the Rev. G. C. HODGKINSON, the Principal, submitted to their Lordships in his Defence. In 8vo. 2s.

RECENT PAMPHLETS AND TRACTS. (*Continued.*)

XI.

A SERMON; preached in the Rectory Church of St. Marylebone, on Sunday, Nov. 19, on occasion of the Death of the Rev. J. H. SPRY, D.D., Rector of the Parish, and Canon of Canterbury. By the Rev. ROBERT WHEELER BUSH, M.A., Morning Preacher, and Head Master of the Islington Proprietary School. In small 8vo. 6*l*.

XII.

AN ESSAY on CAUSALITY. By an Undergraduate of the University of Cambridge. In 8vo. 1*s*. 6*d*.

XIII.

FOUR SERMONS on the PRESENT CRISIS, and other Subjects, preached at Rome, in the Spring of 1854. By the Rev. FRANCIS GARDEN, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. In small 8vo. 1*s*. 6*d*.

Also, by the same Author,

LECTURES on the BEATITUDES. 3*s*. 6*d*.

XIV.

HOSPITALS.—THOUGHTS ON THE INDIRECT ADVANTAGES OF HOSPITALS. By CHARLES HEBERDEN, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. In 12mo. 3*d*.

XV.

“THE CLAIMS OF OUR COUNTRY AND OF GOD:” a SERMON, preached in Quebec Chapel, London, on Sunday, Nov. 19, 1854, and published at the request of the Congregation. By HENRY ALFORD, B.D., Minister of the Chapel. In 8vo. 6*d*.

XVI.

AN ATTEMPT TO ELUCIDATE THE PROPHECIES CONCERNING ANTICHRIST: with Remarks on some Works of J. H. Frere, Esq. By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S., and F.S.A., some time Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. *Second Edition.* In 8vo. 2*s*. 6*d*.

XVII.

THE LATE PAYMENT of WEEKLY WAGES considered in connexion with Sunday Trading in London. By A LAYMAN. In 8vo. 6*d*.

XVIII.

“NO MORE WAR;” A SERMON, in aid of the Patriotic Fund, preached in St. Stephen’s Church, Westminster, on Sunday, Nov. 26, 1854. By the Rev. WILLIAM TENNANT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Stephen’s, Westminster. In 12mo. 6*d*.

XIX.

THE FORM of SOLEMNIZATION of MATRIMONY ILLUSTRATED. By SAMUEL WIX, M.A., F.R.S., Vicar of St. Bartholomew-the-Less. In 18mo. 1*s*. 6*d*.

XX.

“CHRISTIAN SOLEMNITIES;” A SERMON, preached in the New Church of Cockermouth, shortly after its Consecration. By the Rev. JOHN WORDSWORTH, M.A., Vicar of Brigham. In 12mo. 4*d*.

XXI.

SERMON preached in aid of the Patriotic Fund, Nov. 26, 1854. By ROBERT BLACKBURN, M.A., Rector of Selham, Sussex, and late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. In 12mo. 6*d*.

XXII.

“DEATH IN BATTLE;” A SERMON, preached at St. George’s, Hanover Square, on Nov. 25, being the Sunday after the publication of the Nominal Returns of the Killed and Wounded at the Battle of Inkerman. By J. L. ROBERTS, M.A., Fellow of Queen’s College, Oxford, and Curate of St. George’s. In 12mo. 6*d*.

TRACTS

ON CONFIRMATION, THE SACRAMENTS, THE CHURCH
CATECHISM, AND OTHER SUBJECTS.

I.

The RITE of CONFIRMATION EXPLAINED. By the Rev. D. J. EYRE, M.A., Sub-Dean of Sarum. *Fourth Edition.* Price 4*d.*, or 3*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

II.

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS on CONFIRMATION. By W. F. HOOK, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. *Seventh Edition.* Price 2*d.*, or 15*s.* per 100.

III.

A PLAIN CATECHISM before CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. CHARLES DODGSON, M.A. Price 2*d.*

IV.

On the SACRAMENT of the LORD'S SUPPER. By the PLAIN MAN'S FRIEND. *Eighth Edition.* Price 4*d.*

V.

A COMPANION to the LORD'S SUPPER. By the PLAIN MAN'S FRIEND. *New Edition.* Price 8*d.* bound.

VI.

The HAPPY COMMUNICANT. By the Rev. JOHN JAMES, D.D., Author of a "Comment on the Collects." Price 4*d.*

VII.

The BENEFIT of the SACRAMENT of the LORD'S SUPPER EXPLAINED. By EDWARD BURTON, D.D., late Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. *New Edition.* Price 2*d.*, or 15*s.* per 100.

VIII.

An ORDER of PREPARATION for the HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. A. K. B. GRANVILLE, M.A. In 18mo, 6*d.*

IX.

INFANT BAPTISM, and the MODE of ADMINISTERING IT. By R. TWOPENY, B.D. Price 6*d.*

X.

PLAIN REMARKS on INFANT BAPTISM and CONFIRMATION. By W. J. EDGE, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* Price 3*d.*

XI.

The INFANT CHRISTIAN'S FIRST CATECHISM. By Mrs. PARRY, of Barbados. *Sixth Edition.* Price 3*d.*, or 2*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

XII.

IT IS WRITTEN; or, the CATECHISM TEACHING from SCRIPTURE. By the Rev. C. J. HEATHCOTE, M.A., Minister of St. Thomas's, Stamford Hill. Price 4*d.*, or 3*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

XIII.

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS on CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE and DUTY. By a PARENT. Price 4*d.*, or 3*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

XIV.

HELP and COMFORT for the SICK POOR. By the Author of "Sickness: its Trials and Blessings." *Second Edition.* Price 1*s.*

XV.

PRAYERS for the SICK and DYING. By the SAME AUTHOR. Price 2*s.* 6*d.*

XVI.

INSTRUCTIONS for the RELIEF of the SICK POOR in DISEASES of FREQUENT OCCURRENCE. By the late R. PEARSON, M.D. *Third Edition.* In 18mo, 1*s.* 6*d.*

XVII.

The COTTAGER'S PRAYER BOOK. By the late Rev. JAMES BEAN, M.A., Author of "Family Worship." Price 6*d.*

XVIII.

The COTTAGE BEE-HIVE. *Second Edition.* Price 3*d.*, or 2*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

XIX.

THREE WORDS to ONE WHO DRINKS. *New Edition.* Price 3*d.*, or 2*s.* 6*d.* per dozen.

XX.

An EXHORTATION to the LORD'S DAY. By the Rev. R. W. EVANS, M.A., Author of "The Rectory of Valehead." Price 1*s.* 6*d.*

XXI.

IS the CHURCH of ROME the BABYLON of the APOCALYPSE? By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. In 18mo, 1*s.*

XXII.

The FORM of SOLEMNIZATION of MATRIMONY ILLUSTRATED. By SAMUEL WIX, M.A., F.R.S., Vicar of St. Bartholomew-the-Less. In 18mo, 1*s.* 6*d.*

XXIII.

ADVICE to a PUBLIC SCHOOL BOY. By the Rev. F. POYNDER, M.A. *Third Edition.* In 18mo, 6*d.*

XXIV.

The HOLY BIBLE the ONE DESIGN of ONE ETERNAL MIND. By the Rev. DAVID LAING, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity, St. Paneras. *Third Edition.* Price 1*s.*

XXV.

BRIEF HISTORY of the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. By the SAME AUTHOR. Price 1*s.*

XXVI.

An EXPLANATION of DR. WATTS' HYMNS, in Question and Answer. *Fourth Edition.* Price 8*d.*, or 7*s.* per dozen.

XXVII.

SIXTY GEMS from THOMAS A KEMPIS. Price 6*d.*

Recently published, in Eight Volumes, 8vo, price £4 4s., a New and Complete Edition of

THE
WORKS AND CORRESPONDENCE
 OF THE RIGHT HON.
EDMUND BURKE.

THIS EDITION CONTAINS—

1. Mr. BURKE'S CORRESPONDENCE between the year 1744 and his Decease in 1797, first published from the original MSS. in 1844, edited by Earl Fitzwilliam and Sir Richard Bourke; containing numerous Historical and Biographical Notes, and several Original Letters from the leading Statesmen of the period, and forming an Autobiography of this celebrated Writer. The most interesting portion of the Letters of Mr. Burke to Dr. French Laurence, published from the original MSS. by the late Archbishop of Cashel in 1827, is now incorporated in the CORRESPONDENCE:

2. The WORKS of Mr. BURKE, as edited by his Literary Executors, and completed, by the publication of the 15th and 16th Volumes, in 1826, under the superintendance of the late Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Walker King.

“The Writings of that eminent Man, whom posterity will regard as the most eloquent of Orators, and the most profound of the philosophic statesmen of modern times.”

THE LATE SIR ROBERT PEEL.

“The Speeches he made will be the subject of admiration for all succeeding generations.”

LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

“BURKE was one of the first thinkers, as well as one of the greatest Orators, of his time. He is without any parallel in any age or country, except perhaps Lord Bacon and Cicero, and his Works contain an ampler store of political and moral wisdom than can be found in any other writer whatever.”

SIR J. MACKINTOSH.

“That great Master of Eloquence, EDMUND BURKE.”

THE RIGHT HON. T. B. MACAULAY.

“The compositions of BURKE are master-pieces. Who can withstand the fascination and magic of his eloquence? His imperial fancy has laid all nature under tribute, and has collected riches from every scene of the creation and every walk of art. He who can read his Works without pleasure must resign all pretensions to taste and sensibility.”

ROBERT HALL.

“No one can doubt that enlightened men in all ages will hang over the Works of Mr. BURKE.—He was a writer of the first class, and excelled in almost every kind of prose composition. Mr. Fox might well avow, without a compliment, that he had learnt more from him than from all other men and authors.”

LORD BROUGHAM.

* * * *This, the only complete Edition now in circulation, includes the whole of the Contents of the former, published in 20 Vols. 8vo, at the price of £9 5s.*

CLASSICAL AND EDUCATIONAL WORKS,

BY THE

REV. T. KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A.

LATE RECTOR OF LYNDON, AND FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

The Works under the several numbers may be studied at or about the same stage of a pupil's progress.

KEYS (supplied to Tutors only) are published to those Works to which † is prefixed.

LATIN.

1.

† HENRY'S FIRST LATIN BOOK. *Eleventh Edition.* 12mo. 3s.

The object of this Work (which is founded on the principles of imitation and frequent repetition) is to enable the pupil to do exercises from the first day of his beginning his Accidence. It is recommended by the *Oxford Diocesan Board of Education*, as a useful work for Middle or Commercial Schools; and adopted at the *National Society's Training College* at Chelsea.

2.

† A SECOND LATIN BOOK, and PRACTICAL GRAMMAR. Intended as a SEQUEL to *Henry's First Latin Book.* *Sixth Edition.* 12mo. 4s.

† A FIRST VERSE BOOK, PART I.; intended as an easy Introduction to the Latin Hexameter and Pentameter. *Fifth Edition.* 12mo. 2s.

A FIRST VERSE BOOK, PART II.; containing additional Exercises. 1s.

3.

HISTORIÆ ANTIQUÆ EPITOME, from *Cornelius Nepos, Justin, &c.* With English Notes, Rules for Construing, Questions, Geographical Lists, &c. *Fifth Edition.* 4s.

A FIRST CLASSICAL ATLAS, containing fifteen Maps, coloured in outline; intended as a Companion to the *Historiæ Antiquæ Epitome.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"These Maps are executed with great accuracy, and apparently quite free from that indistinctness and disproportion which are the great fault of all our small maps. We think Mr. Arnold successful here as always; and he has done his part to render geography, as it should be, an additional inducement for work."—*Guardian.*

OVID.—ECLOGÆ OVIDIANÆ, with English Notes; PART I. (from the *Elegiac Poems.*) *Eighth Edition.* 12mo. 2s. 6d.

This Work is from the Fifth Part of the *Latvnisches Elementarbuch* of Professors *Jacobs* and *Döring*, which has an immense circulation on the Continent and in America.

OVID.—ECLOGÆ OVIDIANÆ, PART II.; containing Selections from the METAMORPHOSES. With English Notes. 12mo. 5s.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION. *Ninth Edition.* 8vo. 6s. 6d.

This Work is founded on the principles of imitation and frequent repetition. It is at once a Syntax, a Vocabulary, and an Exercise Book; and considerable attention has been paid to the subject of Synonymes. It is now used at all, or nearly all, the public schools.

4.

† CORNELIUS NEPOS, PART I.; with Critical Questions and Answers, and an imitative Exercise on each Chapter. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 4s.

VIRGIL.—The ÆNEID of VIRGIL, with English Notes from DÜBNER. 12mo. 6s.

VIRGIL.—VIRGILII ÆNEIDOS LIBRI I.—VI.; Addita est Interpretatio ex Adnotationibus Heynii, Wunderlichii, Wagneri, Forbigeri, aliorum excerpta. 8vo. 12s.

HORACE.—ECLOGÆ HORATIANÆ, PART I.; CARMINA prope Omnia Continent. Addita est Familiaris Interpretatio ex Adnotationibus Mitscherlichii, Doeringii, Orellii, aliorum excerpta. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 5s.

* * * All the objectionable passages are omitted from this Edition.

HORACE.—The Works of HORACE, followed by English Introductions and Notes, abridged and adapted for School use, from the Edition of FR. DÜBNER. In one Volume, 12mo. 7s.

† A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to LATIN VERSE COMPOSITION.

Contents:—1. "Ideas" for Hexameter and Elegiac Verses. 2. Alcaics. 3. Sapphics. 4. The other Horatian Metres. 5. Appendix of Poetical Phraseology, and Hints on Versification. 8vo. *Third Edition.* 5s. 6d.

GRADUS AD PARNASSUM NOVUS ANTICLEPTICUS; founded on Quicherat's *Thesaurus Poeticus Linguae Latinae.* 8vo. 12s. half-bound.

"This Work is so superior to an ordinary Gradus as scarcely to come under the same category. The epithets and phrases are equally well chosen and well arranged. A treasury it certainly is, and a valuable one too, for all who wish to read and imitate the Latin Poets with success."—*Athenæum.*

ELLISIAN EXERCISES; adapted to the "Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition." 3s. 6d. The KEY, 3s.

5.

ECLOGÆ HISTORICÆ; or, Selections from the Roman Historians (Sallust, Livy, Curtius, Tacitus), with Latin Notes. 12mo. 4s.

CICERO.—Selections from Cicero's ORATIONS, with English Notes, from the best and most recent sources. Contents:—The Fourth Book of the Impeachment of Verres, the Four Speeches against Catiline, and the Speech for the Poet Archias. 12mo. 4s.

CICERO.—Selections from Cicero, with English Notes, PART II.; containing EPISTLES, arranged in the order of time, with accounts of the Consuls, events of each year, &c. 12mo. 5s.

The Notes are from the best Commentators, especially Matthiæ.

CICERO.—Selections from Cicero, PART III.; containing the TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS (entire). With English Notes, translated from the German of TISCHER, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

"The Notes abound in critical and philological remarks of great value. They are copious without being redundant, clearly expressed, and always to the point. All allusions and technical expressions are fully explained. A master's hand is discernible in the translations occasionally given of particular portions that present any difficulty."—*Athenæum*.

CICERO.—Selections from Cicero, PART IV.; containing De FINIBUS MALORUM et BONORUM. (On the Supreme Good.) With a Preface, English Notes, &c., partly from Madvig and others, by the Rev. JAMES BEAVEN, D.D., late Professor of Theology in King's College, Toronto. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

CICERO.—Selections from Cicero, PART V.; containing CATO MAJOR, sive DE SENECTUTE DIALOGUS; with English Notes from Sommerbrodt, by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A., Canon of Chichester. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

TACITUS, PART I. The first Six Books of the ANNALES of TACITUS, ab Excessu Divi Augusti. With English Notes, translated from the German of Dr. KARL NIPPERDEY, by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. 12mo. 6s.

TACITUS, PART II. Books XI.—XVI. 12mo. 5s.

SALLUST.—The HISTORY of the JUGURTHINE WAR, explained by RUDOLF JACOBS. The Notes translated by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

† A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION, PART II.; containing the Doctrine of LATIN PARTICLES, with Vocabulary, an Antibarbarus, &c. *Third Edition*. 8vo. 8s.

6.

† LONGER LATIN EXERCISES, PART I. *Second Edition*. 8vo. 4s.

The object of this Work is to supply boys with an easy collection of short passages, as an Exercise book for those who have gone once, at least, through the First Part of the Editor's "Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition."

† LONGER LATIN EXERCISES, PART II.; containing a Selection of Passages of greater length, in genuine idiomatic English, for Translation into Latin. 8vo. 4s.

† MATERIALS for TRANSLATION into LATIN: selected and arranged by AUGUSTUS GROTEFEND. Translated from the German by the Rev. H. H. ARNOLD, B.A., with Notes and Excursuses. *Third Edition*. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A COPIOUS and CRITICAL ENGLISH-LATIN LEXICON, by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD and the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE. *Third Edition*. 1l. 5s.

An ABRIDGMENT of the above Work, for the Use of Schools. By the Rev. J. C. EBDEN, late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Square 12mo. 10s. 6d. *bound*.

GREEK.

† The FIRST GREEK BOOK; on the Plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." *Third Edition*. 12mo. 5s.

† The SECOND GREEK BOOK (on the same Plan); containing an Elementary Treatise on the Greek Particles and the Formation of Greek Derivatives. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

The THIRD GREEK BOOK, containing Selections from Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, with English Notes, and a Vocabulary. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

The FOURTH GREEK BOOK, containing Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Books IV. to VII., with English Notes. 12mo. 4s.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK ACCIDENCE. With Easy Exercises and Vocabulary. *Fifth Edition*. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION, PART I. *Eighth Edition*. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

This new Edition has been reprinted from the *Sixth* in deference to opinions of authority as to the comparative usefulness of the *Sixth* and *Seventh* Editions, and will remain in future the standard Edition of the Work.

* * * The object of this Work is to enable the Student, as soon as he can decline and conjugate with tolerable facility, to translate simple sentences after given examples, and with given words; the principles trusted to be principally those of *imitation* and *very frequent repetition*. It is at once a Syntax, a Vocabulary, and an Exercise Book.

COMPANION to the above.—A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK CONSTRUCTING. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

This Work is intended to be used simultaneously with the Author's "Practical Introduction to Greek Prose Composition," either as a Reading Book, or for written Exercises.

† A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION, PART II. (On the PARTICLES.) 8vo. 6s. 6d.

A GREEK GRAMMAR; intended as a sufficient Grammar of Reference for Schools and Colleges. *Second Edition.* 8vo, half-bound. 10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR MADVIG'S SYNTAX of the GREEK LANGUAGE, especially of the Attic Dialect; Translated by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. Together with an Appendix on the GREEK PARTICLES, by the Translator. Square 8vo. 8s. 6d.

An ELEMENTARY GREEK GRAMMAR. 12mo. 5s.; or, with Dialects, 6s.

Some Account of the GREEK DIALECTS, for the Use of Beginners; being an Appendix to "An Elementary Greek Grammar." 12mo. 1s. 6d.

An ELEMENTARY GREEK READER, from the ODYSSEY of HOMER. With Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. From the German of Dr. AHRENS, Director of the Lyceum at Hanover. 12mo. 3s.

HOMER for BEGINNERS.—The FIRST THREE BOOKS of the ILIAD, with English Notes; forming a sufficient Commentary for young Students. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

HOMER.—The ILIAD COMPLETE, with English Notes and Grammatical References. In one thick volume, 12mo., half-bound. 12s.

In this Edition, the Argument of each Book is divided into short Sections, which are prefixed to those portions of the Text, respectively, which they describe. The Notes (principally from Dübner) are at the foot of each page. At the end of the volume are useful Appendices.

HOMER.—The ILIAD, Books I. to IV.; with a Critical Introduction, and copious English Notes. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

HOMER.—A Complete GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON for the POEMS of HOMER, and the HOMERIDÆ. Translated from the German of CRUSIUS, by PROFESSOR SMITH. New and Revised Edition. 9s. half-bound.

XENOPHON'S ANABASIS, explained by Dr. F. K. HERTLEIN. In Two Parts. (Part II. forming the "Fourth Greek Book.") Translated from the German, with additional Notes and Grammatical References, by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. 12mo. 6s. 6d.

HERODOTUS.—ECLOGÆ HERODOTEÆ, Part I.; from the Text of Schweighæuser. With English Notes. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

THUCYDIDES, BOOK THE FIRST; with copious English Notes, especially from Poppo and Krüger, and Grammatical References. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

BOOK THE SECOND. 4s. 6d.

DEMOSTHENES, with English Notes from the best and most recent sources, SAUPPE, DOBERENZ, JACOBS, DISSEN, WESTERMANN, &c.

The OLYNTHIAC ORATIONS. 12mo. 3s.

The ORATION on the CROWN. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

The PHILIPPIC ORATIONS. 12mo. 4s.

ÆSCHINES.—SPEECH AGAINST CTESIPHON. 12mo. 4s.

The Text is that of *Boiter* and *Sauppe*; the Notes are by Professor Champlin, with additional Notes by President Woolsey and the Editor.

SOPHOCLES, with English Notes, from SCHNEIDEWIN.

PART I. The AJAX. 3s.

PART II. The PHILOCTETES. 3s. } By the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A.

PART III. The ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS. 4s. }

PART IV. The ŒDIPUS COLONEUS. 4s. } By the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A.

PART V. The ANTIGONE. 4s.

"This Edition of *Antigone* is fully equal in merit to the preceding plays of Sophocles, edited after the German edition of Schneidewin, whose erudite notes are reproduced in English. It is impossible to turn over the pages of this and other editions of the Classics, and to look back upon the School Editions of former days, without gratefully acknowledging how much has been done by Mr. Kerchever Arnold towards the advancement of sound classical learning by his admirable publications."—*John Bull*.

EURIPIDES, with English Notes, from HARTUNG, DÜBNER, WITZSCHEL, SCHÖNE, &c.

The HECUBA. 3s.

The HIPPOLYTUS. 3s.

The BACCHÆ. 3s.

The MEDEA. 3s.

The IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS. 3s.

ARISTOPHANES.—ECLOGÆ ARISTOPHANICÆ, PART I.; Selections from the CLOUDS, with English Notes, by Professor FELTON. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

PART II., containing the BIRDS. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

In these Editions the objectionable passages are omitted

CLASSICAL EXAMINATION PAPERS. A Series of 93 Extracts from Greek, Roman, and English Classics, for Translation, with occasional Questions and Notes; each extract on a separate leaf. Price of the whole in a specimen packet, 4s., or 6 copies of any Separate Paper may be had for 3*l*.

HEBREW.

- The FIRST HEBREW BOOK ; on the Plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 "The arrangement is excellent. The addition of *English* characters is very well calculated to assist the learner, and to incite those who, from the difficulty of reading fluently, are disinclined to become learners."—*English Churchman*.
- A KEY to the FIRST HEBREW BOOK. Edited by the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. 3s. 6d.
- The SECOND HEBREW BOOK, containing the BOOK of GENESIS ; together with a Hebrew Syntax, and a Vocabulary and Grammatical Commentary. 9s.

GERMAN.

- The FIRST GERMAN BOOK ; on the Plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." By the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD and Dr. FRÄDERSDORFF. *Fourth Edition*. 12mo. 5s. 6d.
- A KEY to the EXERCISES, by Dr. FRÄDERSDORFF. 2s. 6d.
- A READING COMPANION to the FIRST GERMAN BOOK ; containing Extracts from the best Authors, with a copious Vocabulary and explanatory Notes. 12mo. 4s.
- A HANDBOOK of GERMAN VOCABULARY. 4s.
- The SECOND GERMAN BOOK ; a SYNTAX, and ETYMOLOGICAL VOCABULARY, with copious Reading-Lessons and Exercises. Edited by Dr. FRÄDERSDORFF. 12mo. 6s. 6d.

FRENCH.

- The FIRST FRENCH BOOK ; on the Plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." *Third Edition*. 12mo. 5s. 6d.
- A KEY to the EXERCISES, by M. DELILLE. 2s. 6d.
- A HANDBOOK of FRENCH VOCABULARY. 4s. 6d.

ENGLISH.

- HENRY'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR ; a Manual for Beginners. 12mo. 3s. 6d.
- SPELLING turned ETYMOLOGY. 12mo. 2s. 6d.
- The PUPIL'S BOOK, (a Companion to the above.) 1s. 3d.
- LATIN *viâ* ENGLISH ; being the SECOND PART of the above Work. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
- An ENGLISH GRAMMAR for CLASSICAL SCHOOLS ; being a Practical Introduction to "English Prose Composition." *Fifth Edition*. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

HANDBOOKS FOR THE CLASSICAL STUDENT (WITH QUESTIONS), under the General Superintendence and Editorship of the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD.

"The leading characteristic of these Handbooks is their exceeding simplicity, the excellent order with which they are arranged, the completeness of their details, and the remarkable accuracy and elaborate erudition which they exhibit in every page. They have this further advantage, which it is impossible to over-estimate;—that they bring down their respective subjects to the very latest period, and present us with the results of the most recent investigations of the critics and antiquarians by whom they have been discussed."—*Dublin Review*, Oct. 1, 1851.

- I. HANDBOOKS of HISTORY and GEOGRAPHY. From the German of PÜTZ. Translated by the Rev. R. B. PAUL.
1. ANCIENT HISTORY. *Second Edition*. 6s. 6d. } These Works have been already translated into the Swedish and Dutch languages.
2. MIDDLEVAL HISTORY. 4s. 6d.
3. MODERN HISTORY. 5s. 6d.
- II. The ATHENIAN STAGE, from the German of WITZSCHNEL. Translated by the Rev. R. B. PAUL. 4s.
- III. 1. GRECIAN ANTIQUITIES. } From the Swedish of BOJESEN. Translated from Dr. HOFFA's German version by the Rev. R. B. PAUL.
2. ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. } *Second Edition*. 3s. 6d.

The pupil will receive from these works a correct and tolerably complete picture of Grecian and Roman life: the political portions (the account of the national institutions and their effects) appear to be of great value; while the very moderate extent of each admits of its being thoroughly mastered—of its being got up and retained.

3. HEBREW ANTIQUITIES. By the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A. 4s.

This Work describes the manners and customs of the ancient Hebrews which were common to them with other nations, and the rites and ordinances which distinguished them as the chosen people Israel.

IV. HANDBOOKS of SYNONYMES :

1. GREEK SYNONYMES. From the French of PILLON. 6s. 6d.
2. LATIN SYNONYMES, from the German of DÜDERLEIN. Translated by the Rev. H. H. ARNOLD. *Second Edition*. 4s.

V. HANDBOOK of GRECIAN MYTHOLOGY. From the German of Professor SCROLL, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL. (*With Outline Engravings of Ancient Statues.*) 5s.

VI. HANDBOOK of CHRONOLOGY.—ANNALES Veterum REGNORUM et POPULORUM, imprimis Romanorum, confecti à C. T. ZUMPTIO. 5s.

The BOY'S ARITHMETIC, PART I. By the Rev. CHARLES ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Tinwell, and late Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. *Second Edition*. 12mo. 3s. 6d. Also, PART II. 3s. 6d.

The object of this book is to make Arithmetic easier to little boys, by enabling them to understand it, and to prevent their forgetting a rule as soon as they have entered upon a new one.

LONDON :

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01147 0426

